INTERSTATE ARBITRATIONS IN THE GREEK WORLD, 337-90 B.C.

SHEILA L. AGER

HELLENISTIC CULTURE AND SOCIETY

General Editors: Anthony W. Bulloch, Erich S. Gruen, A. A. Long, and *Andrew F. Stewart*

I. Alexander to Actium: The Historical Evolution of the Hellenistic Age, by *Peter Green*

II. Hellenism in the East: The Interaction of Greek and Non-Greek Civilizations from Syria to Central Asia after Alexander, edited by *Amélie Kuhrt* and *Susan Sherwin-White*

III. The Question of "Eclecticism": Studies in Later Greek Philosophy, edited by *J. M. Dillon* and *A. A. Long*

IV. Antigonus the One-Eyed and the Creation of the Hellenistic State, by *Richard A. Billows*

V. A History of Macedonia, by *R. Malcolm Errington*, translated by *Catherine Errington*

VI. Attic Letter-Cutters of 229 to 86 B.C., by *Stephen V. Tracy*

VII. The Vanished Library: A Wonder of the Ancient World, by *Luciano Canfora*

VIII. Hellenistic Philosophy of Mind, by *Julia Annas*

IX. Hellenistic Culture and History, by *Peter Green* et al.

X. The Best of the Argonauts: The Redefinition of the Epic Hero in Book 1 of Apollonius's *Argonautica*, by *James J. Clauss*

XI. Faces of Power: Alexander's Image and Hellenistic Politics, by *Andrew Stewart*

XII. Images and Ideologies: Self-Definition in the Hellenistic World, by *A. W. Bulloch* et al.

XIII. From Samarkand to Sardis: A New Approach to the Seleucid Empire, by *Susan Sherwin-White* and *Amélie Kuhrt*

XIV. Regionalism and Change in the Economy of Independent Delos, by *Gary Reger*

XV. Hegemony to Empire: The Development of the Roman Imperium in the East from 148 to 62 B.C., by *Robert Kallet-Marx*

XVI. Moral Vision in the Histories of Polybius, by *Arthur M. Eckstein*

XVII. The Hellenistic Settlements in Europe, the Islands, and Asia Minor, by *Getzel M. Cohen*

XVIII. Interstate Arbitrations in the Greek World, 337–90 B.C., by *Sheila L. Ager*

XIX. Theocritus's Urban Mimes: Mobility, Gender, and Patronage, by *Joan B. Burton*

XX. Athenian Democracy in Transition: Attic Letter-Cutters of 340 to 290 B.C., by *Stephen V. Tracy*

XXI. Pseudo-Hecataeus, On the Jews: Legitimizing the Jewish Diaspora, by *Bezalel Bar-Kochva*

XXII. Asylia: Territorial Inviolability in the Hellenistic World, by *Kent J. Rigsby*

XXIII. The Cynics: The Cynic Movement in Antiquity and Its Legacy, edited by *R. Bracht Branham* and *Marie-Odile Goulet-Cazé*

XXIV. The Politics of Plunder: Aitolians and Their *Koinon* in the Early Hellenistic Era, 279–217 B.C., by *Joseph B. Scholten*

XXV. *The Argonautika* by Apollonios Rhodios, translated, with introduction, commentary, and glossary, by *Peter Green*

XXVI. Hellenistic Constructs: Culture, History, and Historiography, edited by *Paul Cartledge*

Interstate Arbitrations in the Greek World, 337–90 B.C.

Interstate Arbitrations in the Greek World, 337–90 B.C.

Sheila L. Ager

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS
Berkeley Los Angeles London

The publisher gratefully acknowledges the contribution provided by the General Endowment of the Associates of the University of California Press.

The publisher is also grateful for assistance from The University of Waterloo.

University of California Press
Berkeley and Los Angeles, California

University of California Press, Ltd.
London, England

© 1996 by
The Regents of the University of California

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Ager, Sheila L., 1956–
Interstate arbitrations in the Greek world, 337–90 B.C.
/ Sheila L. Ager
p. cm. — (Hellenistic culture and society : 18)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 0-520-08162-5
1. Arbitration and award (Greek law) I. Title. II. Series.
KL4357.A34 1995
343.38'09–dc20
[343.8039] 94-1292
CIP

Printed in the United States of America
9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Sciences—Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1984.

Contents

PREFACE xiii

INTRODUCTION 3

THE CASES

1. The Delphic Amphiktyony judges a border dispute between Amphissa and Delphi (c. 338/7?) 37
2. The constitution of the League of Corinth (337) 39
3. Argos arbitrates between Kimolos and Melos at the request of the League of Corinth (337 or later) 43
4. The Ionian League judges a question of religious administration (335 or earlier) 45
5. Officials of Alexander III arbitrate between Philippi and neighbouring Thracian tribes (c. 335 or 330) 47
6. Alexander III calls for a boundary settlement between Aspendos and a neighbour, perhaps Side (early 333) 50
7. Various states request adjudications from Alexander III (323) 51
8. Tarentum demands that Rome and the Samnites mediate their conflict (320 or 314?) 52
9. Akrotatos of Sparta mediates a treaty for Apollonia and Illyria (315) 54
10. Hamilcar of Carthage settles the conflict between Messana and Agathokles of Syracuse (315–313) 55
11. Antigonos I adjudicates the issue of the Lokrian maiden tribute (c. 305?) 57
12. Several states mediate between Rhodes and Demetrios Poliorketes (304) 59
13. Antigonos I synoikises Lebedos and Teos (c. 303) 61

14. The constitution of the Hellenic League of Antigonos and Demetrios (302) 65
15. Kos carries out a boundary arbitration between Klazomenai and Teos (c. 302?) 67
16. The Boiotian League settles the borders of Koroneia and Lebadeia (fourth or third century?) 69
17. The Boiotian League settles the borders of Akraipheia and Kopai (third century) 71
18. An arbitration between Boura and an unknown state (third century) 72
19. Eretria arbitrates between Naxos and another state (?) (third century?) 73
20. Elis arbitrates the borders of Phanoteus and Stiris (third century) 74
21. Knidos arbitrates a loan dispute between Kalymna and Kos (c. 300–286) 75
22. Pausanias of Thessaly judges a border dispute between Amphissa and Delphi (c. 290–280?) 83
23. Thessalian Larisa arbitrates between the Hypoknemidian and Epiknemidian Lokrians (?) (c. 290–280?) 84
24. Lysimachos awards a sacred precinct to Samothrace (288–281) 86
25. Lysimachos settles a conflict between Magnesia (and the "Pedieis") and Priene (?) (287/6) 87
26. Lysimachos arbitrates between Priene and Samos (283/2) 89
27. Pyrrhos offers to resolve the conflict between Rome and the Italian Greeks (280) 94
28. A judgement between two unknown states by Dorian arbitrators (c. 280?) 96
29. Kleonymos of Sparta oversees a treaty between Phalasarna and Polyrhenia (before 273) 98
30. Judges from Kassandreia arbitrate the borders of Melitaia, Chalai, and Peuma (c. 270–260?) 99
31. Judges from Kassandreia arbitrate the borders of Pereia, Phylladon, and Peuma (c. 270–260?) 101
32. Pyllos of Macedon arbitrates between Melitaia and Narthakion (c. 270–260 or c. 210–200?) 103
33. The Aitolian and Akarnanian leagues provide for an arbitration between Agrai and Stratos (c. 263–262?) 105
34. Herakleia Pontica offers to resolve the conflict between Byzantion and Istros-Kallatis (253–247) 108
35. Ptolemy II offers to mediate between Carthage and Rome in the First Punic War (252) 109
36. Members of the Achaian League arbitrate between two unknown states (c. 250–200) 110
37. Elis arbitrates between Alipheira and a neighbouring state (?) (244–219) 111

38. The Achaian League requests Megara to arbitrate between Corinth and Epidauros (242/1–238/7) 113
39. Mantineia condemns Aratos and the Achaian League for an attack on Argos (240) 118
40. The Aitolian League arranges an isopolity between Messene and Phigaleia (c. 240) 119
41. Thyrrheion arbitrates the boundaries of Matropolis and Oiniadai (239–231) 124
42. A Ptolemaic official arbitrates between Arsinoë (Cilicia) and Nagidos (238–221) 126
43. The Achaian League calls for arbitration between Megalopolis and Orchomenos (after 235) 129
44. The Achaian League (?) calls for arbitration between Argos and Kleonai (c. 229?) 132
45. Border dispute between Megalopolis and Sparta (229–221) 133
46. The Achaian League arranges an arbitration between Arsinoë and Epidauros (after 228) 135
47. An arbitration clause in a treaty between Eleutherna and Antigonos III (c. 224?) 137
48. An arbitration clause in a treaty between Hierapytna and Antigonos III (c. 224?) 138
49. Byzantion tries to mediate between Achaios and Attalos I (222–220) 139
50. Antigonos III supports Messene in a land dispute with Sparta (c. 222) 140
51. Kavaros the Gaul mediates a peace between Byzantion, Rhodes, and Bithynia (220) 142
52. Several states try to mediate between Antiochos and Ptolemy in the Fourth Syrian War (219/8) 143
53. Several states try to mediate the Social War between Aitolia and Philip V (218–217) 145
54. Officials of Philip V arbitrate between Gonnoi and Herakleion (after 218?) 147
55. The Aitolian League appoints arbitrators for Melitaia and Xyniai (214/3) 151
56. The Aitolian League appoints arbitrators to carry out a sympolity between Melitaia and Pereia (213/2) 153
57. Several states try to mediate the First Macedonian War (209–205) 157
58. Mediation on the island of Crete (end of the third century) 161
59. Rome demands that Philip V arbitrate his disputes with Attalos I and Rhodes (200) 163
60. Rome intervenes between Antiochos III and Ptolemy V (200) 165
61. The Achaian League offers to mediate between Philip V and Rhodes (200) 167
62. An arbitration between Chyretiai and Erikinion (c. 200?) 168

63. Judges from Miletos and Rhodes arbitrate between Hermione and Epidauros (c. 200) 170
64. Karpathos (?) mediates between two unknown states (third or second century) 173
65. Dispute between Angeiai and Ktimenai, arbitrated by Thaumakoi (?) (late third or early second century) 174
66. An Apollonian mediates between Kallatis and an enemy (third or second century?) 176
67. An agreement between Hierapytna and Priansos (early second century) 178
68. A treaty between unknown states, envisioning Sikinos as an arbitrator (?) (first third of the second century) 181
69. An arbitration between Kaphyai and Tegea (?) (second century) 183
70. A territorial arbitration between Kondaia and an unknown state, perhaps Gonnoi (second century) 184
71. Knidos arbitrates between Klazomenai and Temnos (first half of the second century) 186
72. The conference at the Aous between Flamininus and Philip V (198) 192
73. Rome intervenes between Antiochos III and Attalos I (198) 194
74. Rhodes arbitrates a territorial dispute between Priene and Samos (c. 197–190) 196
75. The Achaian League and Athens mediate between the Boiotians and Flamininus (196) 210
76. The Roman settlement of Greece after the Second Macedonian War (196) 211
77. The conference at Lysimacheia between Roman legates and Antiochos III (fall 196) 215
78. Larisa challenges Pteleion to accept Roman arbitration (after 196?) 218
79. A boundary dispute between Melitaia and Narthakion settled through the Thessalian League (after 196) 220
80. A Tenian tribunal arbitrates between Zarax and Epidauros Limera (?) (after 195) 221
81. The Lakedaimonian *koinon* arbitrates between Geronthrai and a neighbour (after 195) 223
82. A boundary arbitration (?) between Alipheira and Lepreion (after 194/3?) 226
83. An Eretrian arbitration between Naxos and Paros (194–166) 228
84. The Aitolians and Rome discuss mediation (192) 230
85. Kassopa and Thyrrheion arbitrate between Boiotian Aigosthena and Achaian Pagai (c. 192) 233
86. Flamininus intervenes between the Achaian League and Messene (191) 235
87. Corinthian judges carry out an arbitration for Elis and an unknown state (after 191) 236

88. Rome and the Delphic Amphiktyony (?) settle disputes between Amphissa, Delphi, Myania, and Antikyra (190) 238
89. A sympolity between Hypnia and Myania calling for arbitration (c. 190?) 248
90. Chios settles various disputes between Lampsakos and Parion (c. 190 or shortly after?) 251
91. A Prienian citizen acts as an advocate for Phokaia (?) (c. 190) 252
92. The constitution of the Lesbian League (between c. 190? and 167) 254
93. Herakleia Pontica suggests mediation to Antiochos III and Rome (190) 256
94. Athens and Rhodes intercede with Rome on behalf of Aitolia (190–189) 258
95. Fabius Labeo attempts to reconcile the Cretan states (189) 262
96. Conflict between the Achaian League and Sparta (188) 263
97. The Peace of Apameia (188) 266
98. The Roman settlement of Asia after the Antiochene War (188) 267
99. Manlius Vulso decides the land dispute between Priene and Samos (188) 270
100. Smyrna arbitrates between Miletos and Priene, perhaps at the request of Rome (after 188?) 271
101. Rome settles a boundary dispute between Mylasa and Stratonikeia (after 188) 273
102. Roman intervention between Rhodes and Lycia (188 and later) 275
103. Future boundary arbitration envisioned between Pidasa and a neighbour (?) (188/7?) 278
104. L. Scipio attempts mediation between Antiochos III and Eumenes II (?) (187) 279
105. Megara mediates between Boiotia and the Achaian League (187/6) 280
106. Various states complain of Philip V to Rome (186/5 and later) 281
107. A boundary arbitration between Othorne and Polichne (186/5 or 161/0?) 288
108. Treaty between Herakleia and Miletos providing for arbitration (185/4) 290
109. Rhodes and other states mediate a peace between Magnesia and Miletos (second half of the 180s) 292
110. Appius Claudius mediates between Gortyn and Knossos (184) 297
111. Conflict between the Achaian League and Sparta (184/3) 298
112. Flamininus attempts to mediate between Eumenes II and Prousias I (183) 302
113. Roman representatives intervene between the Achaian League and Messene (183) 304
114. Roman mediation in the war between Eumenes II and Pharnakes (183–180) 305

115. Boiotian envoys mediate between Messene and the Achaian League (182) 309
116. The Achaian League settles the territorial holdings of Megalopolis and Messene-Thouria (shortly after 182) 310
117. Rhodian judges attempt arbitration between Amphissa and Delphi (179) 314
118. A multistate tribunal arbitrates between Azoros and Mondaia (soon after 178) 318
119. Rhodian judges regulate the Achaian honours for Eumenes II (c. 175) 319
120. Mylasa arbitrates between Magnesia and Priene at the request of Rome (c. 175–160) 321
121. Rhodes, Ptolemy VI, and others attempt mediation in the Third Macedonian War (172–168) 327
122. Rome, Rhodes, and the Achaian League intervene in the Sixth Syrian War (170–168) 336
123. Rome attempts to mediate between Eumenes II and the Galatians (167) 341
124. Rhodes arbitrates between Mylasa and Euromos (167? or first century?) 343
125. Chalkis arbitrates a land dispute between Erythrai and Hypata (between 167 and 146?) 345
126. Boundary settlements between Delphi and its neighbours Ambryssos and Phlygonion (between c. 167 and c. 140?) 347
127. Magnesia offers to mediate between Gortyn and Knossos (before 167?) 350
128. A Ptolemaic arbitration between Gortyn and Knossos (c. 167) 356
129. Thebes arbitrates between Boumelita and Halai (after 167?) 359
130. The Lycian *koinon* arbitrates a boundary dispute between Araxa and a neighbour (after 167 or later?) 366
131. Rome asks Korkyra to arbitrate between Ambrakia and Athamania (c. 166?) 367
132. Athens arbitrates between Akarnania and Ambrakia (?) (166) 369
133. Skarphai and Thronion dispute the hieromnemonic vote (c. 165–160 and later?) 370
134. The Roman senate mediates between Eumenes II and Prousias II (164–160) 372
135. Roman legates arbitrate between Sparta and Megalopolis (163) 374
136. Roman legates arbitrate between Sparta and Argos (?) (163) 376
137. An arbitration between the Achaian League and Sparta over Sparta's dispute with Megalopolis (after 163) 377
138. Officials of Ptolemy VI settle disputes between Arsinoë and Troizen (between 163 and 146) 381
139. Lamia arbitrates a dispute between Doris and Sparta over the hieromnemonic vote (161/0) 385
140. Rome supports a Delian-Achaian claim against Athens (159/8) 386

141. Rome and Sikyon arbitrate between Athens and Oropos (156–155) 387
142. Rome mediates between Attalos II and Prousias II (156–154) 388
143. Priene appeals to Rome for intervention with Ariarathes (c. 155/4) 391
144. Rome settles the Second Cretan War (153) 394
145. Patrai arbitrates disputes between Megalopolis and Thouria (c. 150) 394
146. Pergamene judges arbitrate between Mytilene and Pitane (between c. 150 and 133) 396
147. Conflict between the Achaian League and Sparta (150–147) 405
148. Rome attempts to mediate between Prousias II and Nikomedes (149) 409
149. Metellus arbitrates between Thebes and various states (147) 410
150. Mummius arbitrates between Sparta and Messene (?) (146/5) 411
151. Rome settles a dispute between Hermione and Troizen (?) (after 146?) 413
152. Mummius arbitrates between Argos and Kleonai (?) (145) 414
153. Makon of Larisa arbitrates between Halos and Phthiotic Thebes (between c. 145 and 137) 415
154. A multistate tribunal from Asia Minor arbitrates between Melitaia and Narthakion (c. 143?) 420
155. Scipio Aemilianus in the East (144/3 or 140/39?) 423
156. The Roman senate arbitrates between Melitaia and Narthakion (c. 140?) 425
157. A boundary arbitration between two unknown states (c. 140?) 429
158. Magnesia and Rome settle the disputes of Hierapytna and Itanos (c. 140–111) 431
159. Miletos arbitrates between Messene and Sparta at the request of Rome (c. 138) 446
160. The Roman senate upholds the Rhodian judgement between Priene and Samos (shortly before 135 and 135) 450
161. Bargylia arbitrates a dispute between Rhodes and Stratonikeia (c. 130) 457
162. Disputes between Kolophon and its neighbours settled by Rome (c. 130–120) 459
163. Rome and the Amphiktyony settle affairs at Delphi (125?) 461
164. Lato and Olos turn to Knossos and Rome for arbitration (117/6–111/0) 466
165. Lyttos and Olos conclude a treaty with the help of Athens and Rhodes (?) (111/0) 475
166. An arbitration over the Euboian Amphiktyonic vote (c. 110) 479
167. Arbitrations between Skarphai and Thronion over boundaries and the Amphiktyonic vote (c. 110) 482
168. Arbitration between Megalopolis and a neighbour (?) (c. 105–102?) 490

169. The senate arbitrates a land dispute between Abdera and Kotys of Thrace (late second/early first century) 493
170. Ephesos and Sardis conclude an arbitration treaty (98/7 or 94/3) 496
171. Erythrai and Sardis try to arbitrate between Miletos and Priene (c. 91/0) 503

APPENDIX 511

CONCORDANCE 525

INDICES 533

I. Literary Passages 535
II. Epigraphic Sources 539
III. Names of Persons and Places 547
IV. Subjects 555
V. Greek and Latin Terms 559

ABBREVIATIONS 571

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY 575

PREFACE

The origins of the phenomenon of third-party intervention in order to end disputes and prevent wars between other states lie far back in ancient history. The ancient Near East provides an example of arbitration from the Bronze Age: the delineation of the border between Umma and Lagash by Mesalim, king of Kish (J. S. Cooper, *Sources from the Ancient Near East* 2.1 [Malibu, 1983]). Perhaps we should trace the roots of Greek international arbitration to its oriental predecessors; but by the classical period the Greeks had made arbitration an integral part of their own diplomatic life, in part because the Greek political system was more amenable to the use of arbitration than was the "superpower" system of the Near East. By the fifth century B.C. the Greek poleis were already attaching arbitration clauses to their treaties, clauses that tried to provide for the pacific settlement of future disputes. Instead of using the time-honoured method of warfare, some Greeks were apparently trying to settle their differences through diplomacy and negotiation.

In the Hellenistic period, as diplomatic protocol in general became more and more refined, third-party diplomacy also became more significant. From the two and a half centuries following the battle of Chaironeia there is evidence for between 150 and 200 examples of arbitration or mediation, as opposed to some 60 cases from the four centuries preceding Chaironeia. Luigi Piccirilli examined the pre-338 evidence in his work *Gli arbitrati interstatali greci* (1973). His is the most recent exhaustive case study of arbitration for the classical age. Earlier works, such as those of A. Raeder and M. N. Tod from the early years of the twentieth century, were detailed studies for their time. But neither of these works provided the testimonia for the cases it examined, nor did either pay sufficient attention to the literary evidence.

This book is intended to be a continuation of Piccirilli's study. An upper limit has therefore been imposed by the lower limit of Piccirilli's work: Philip II's "arbitrations" in the Peloponnese after his victory in Greece. A reasonable

lower limit for this collection was harder to find. As Rome became increasingly involved in Greek affairs through the second and first centuries, the nature of "interstate arbitration" changed. But there is no clear date that provides a watershed, particularly when we see that long after Rome became dominant in matters of Greek interstate relations, it was still passing on the actual task of arbitration to other neutral Greek states. My final decision on a lower chronological limit was ultimately determined by the evidence available—some important cases from the turn of the second and first centuries—rather than by any conviction that the year 90 B.C. was of peculiar significance.

A few words should be said about the criteria for the inclusion of particular cases. In many instances I considered it to be more valuable to take an inclusive rather than an exclusive approach. Arbitration can be seen as a strictly defined legal process: both disputants are to submit legal arguments and then accept the neutral and binding judgement of a disinterested third party. In theory, they are to abide by that judgement even if they consider it unacceptable. Adhered to rigidly, arbitration leaves no room for mediation and compromise. But it is clear, particularly in international relations, that the best interests of all concerned are frequently better served by mediation than by the strict legal procedure of arbitration. This is recognized by such modern bodies as the International Court of Justice, whose mandate includes the equitable settlement of disputes, "even though such a settlement may not be in conformity with the legal rights and duties of the parties" (G. Schwarzenberger and E. D. Brown, *A Manual of International Law* [Milton, England, 1976] p. 197). The Greeks recognized that it was much better to achieve a settlement through agreement, if at all possible, than through judgement. Many of their arbitrators acted also as mediators. This was especially the case when foreign judges came to a state to settle outstanding differences between citizens; these judges usually earned the gratitude of the state they visited by trying to achieve a voluntary compromise between the disputants before going on to give a formal judgement. While this related phenomenon of foreign judges has not been dealt with in this study, the desire to achieve a settlement through mediation before going to arbitration also appears in interstate disputes (see, for example, **74** and **137**).

Arbitration, then, cannot always be separated from the related phenomenon of mediation and voluntary compromise. On occasion it can even be difficult to distinguish it from the harsher diplomacy of dictation. The approach taken in this study has therefore been a broad rather than a narrow one. This inclusive approach is especially requisite when dealing with the literary evidence. Despite the often frustrating and fragmented nature of the epigraphic evidence, its more formulaic nature sometimes makes it a better source for determining cases of "true" arbitration. The epigraphic sources, for example, are more likely to draw a distinction between cύλλυcιc (mediation) and κρίcιc (judgement). The literary sources, on the other hand, rarely display interest in the exact details of

the phenomenon of arbitration as such, and the actual character of third-party interventions recorded by the historians is often masked by that lack of concern.

Clearly the final decision on the inclusion of cases cannot be said to be an exact science. In the interest of completeness I have indulged in a certain amount of inconsistency; some cases are present without as good a claim to being called interstate arbitration as others. Some significant examples of mediation and related diplomatic activity have been included for the sake of the maximum rather than the minimum breadth of vision on the world of international law and diplomacy (e.g., **12**). In addition, the inclusion of some cases may be controversial for a variety of other reasons; see, for example, the dubious attempt by Herakleia to mediate between Rome and Antiochos III (**93**). The appearance of such cases here does not necessarily indicate my acceptance of them as historical fact. I felt it best, when it came to the basic inclusion of cases, not to cloud the issue with my own biases. Such an approach would produce only a partial picture of the evidence.

Another criterion that I have tried to adhere to as far as possible is that the cases included must deal with *interstate* arbitration. *Symbola*—agreements, which often provided for international arbitration between *individual* members of different states—as well as other cases of international arbitration involving individuals, have been excluded, although some examples will be found in the appendix. Those that have been included are generally here owing to some unique circumstances of the case, such as certain instances where an individual's home state took up his cause (e.g., **21**).

All instances of arbitration that involved Greeks or the Hellenistic kingdoms in any way have been included. Frequently in the Hellenistic period the arbitrators were not Greek, but if at least one of the disputants was Greek, then the case has been included. Similarly, if the arbitrator was Greek, but neither of the disputants was, the evidence has still been cited here. Instances of wholly non-Greek arbitration, however, have been excluded. Thus Rome's arbitration between Carthage and Massinissa does not appear here, although it does fall within the time frame of the study (Polyb. 32.2; Livy 34.62, 40.17, 42.23-24; App. *Pun.* 68-69). Neither is this collection intended to be a definitive or exhaustive study of Roman relations with the East in the Hellenistic age. Although there is a fair amount of material on Rome's involvement with the states of the eastern Mediterranean, this work should not be seen as a comprehensive examination of senatorial diplomacy in this period from the *Roman* point of view; for example, there is little on Roman involvement with the non-Greek kingdoms of Anatolia.

The format of the book follows that of Piccirilli's work: it is a collection of the evidence rather than a thematic analysis of the phenomenon. Each instance of arbitration has been identified and dealt with as a case study. Each case study includes a bibliography specific to that case, the relevant testimonia, and a commentary. The general bibliography at the end of the work consists of select works of some relevance to the phenomenon of arbitration or the history of the

Hellenistic period. The individual cases should be consulted for more detailed bibliographic information.

I have also retained the basic chronological structure employed by Piccirilli; all things considered, this approach is the most logical. A regional arrangement, such as Tod's, has little real value. It also tends to obscure certain patterns that become clear when the cases are arranged chronologically, such as the large number of boundary disputes all over the Greek world, all submitted to Roman arbitration around 140 B.C. But if a chronological arrangement of the cases seems more valuable than a regional one, then the question may be raised whether a topical arrangement of the cases would not be still more valuable for a researcher interested in, say, federal arbitration. The difficulty with a topical arrangement is twofold: first of all, there are several cases of fragmented inscriptions that quite clearly deal with an arbitration but do not allow us to determine the circumstances. In such cases, a topical arrangement would be pointless. Second, there are numerous cases that could conceivably be categorized under a number of different headings. In the end, the tried (if not always so true) method of chronological order seemed best.

The case studies are followed by an appendix, which is intended to amplify further the picture of interstate arbitration in the Hellenistic period by summarizing certain testimonia that have been excluded from the main body of cases for a variety of reasons. Here may be found some instances of *symbola*, included for comparative purposes, as well as summaries of those cases of Raeder and Tod that were not included as cases here because they did not fit the criteria. The appendix also includes some pieces of epigraphic evidence that may well point to instances of arbitration but are so extremely fragmented that there is little point in speculating on them.

With respect to the epigraphic format of the case studies the following conventions should be noted:

*	the chief epigraphic edition employed
[α]	letters believed to have been on the stone originally, now totally illegible or lost
⟨α⟩	correct letters to replace those accidentally left out or incorrectly inscribed by the engraver
{α}	excess letters or words mistakenly added by the engraver
(α)	letters added by the editor to a word deliberately abbreviated on the stone
[[α]]	deliberate erasures (if they can be restored)
α̣	still visible fragment of letters, restored by the editor

This book represents a revision of my doctoral dissertation at the University of British Columbia. I would like to acknowledge the aid and support of various institutions and individuals in its production, though any errors or shortcomings

in the work are naturally my own. My adviser, Phillip Harding, deserves my sincere thanks for his helpful advice and encouragement. I benefitted also from the advice offered to me by the external reviewer of my dissertation, Erich Gruen. I am grateful to the Izaak Walton Killam Foundation and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, both of which provided me with valuable financial support during the period when I was working on the dissertation. Further support has come from my own institution, the University of Waterloo. I would also like to thank Mary Lamprech of the University of California Press for her patience and commitment to the publication of this study, and Marian Rogers for her painstaking editing work.

Introduction

Introduction

Sometime in the late fourth century B.C. the tiny islands of Melos and Kimolos became involved in a territorial dispute with each other over the possession of three even tinier islets. The two states turned to the League of Corinth for help; the League *synedrion* appointed Argos as an arbitrator to settle the quarrel. In the last year of his life, Alexander the Great received deputations from numerous Greek cities, embassies that had been sent to ask him to arbitrate disagreements between them and their neighbours. When Rhodes was under siege by the forces of Demetrios Poliorketes in 305/4, Athens and other states dispatched ambassadors to mediate between the two sides and reach a negotiated peace. And numerous states, such as Priene and Samos in Asia Minor, Melitaia and Narthakion in southern Thessaly, and Sparta along with its neighbours Messene and Megalopolis in the Peloponnese, fought judicial battles over contested territory again and again over the centuries.

Submission of a dispute to the arbitrating power of a third party was clearly a frequent expedient in international relations in ancient Greece, not only in the Hellenistic period but in earlier centuries as well. And this was not a phenomenon restricted to the great powers of the day. Indeed, it seems to be typical of international arbitration, in the ancient as in the modern world, that smaller states would often be the most likely to appeal to the process. For a powerful state, submission to a binding judicial process could represent a restriction of goals that might otherwise easily be achieved by military action or economic pressures. A less significant power, incapable of pursuing its own interests through such means, would have nothing to lose and perhaps everything to gain by an appeal to arbitration. The examples of Melos and Kimolos, Melitaia and Narthakion, and many others are sufficient to illustrate this point. The institution of arbitration might be the only protection smaller states could have in their dealings with greater powers.

THE DISPUTES

The disputes submitted to arbitration in the ancient world were various and wide-ranging. Most often the problem to be resolved was a matter of boundaries, but other matters might arise: quarrels involving injuries to national pride, allegations of debt, or problems relating to the conclusion of treaties. One of the more singular areas of conflict between the Greek states was the question of religious jurisdiction. Several documents survive that indicate that disputes of this nature were frequently submitted to international arbitration.[1] Disputes concerning religious jurisdiction commonly focused on the control of a particular shrine or sanctuary, and the prestige and profits therefrom. The boundary disagreements so typical of ancient arbitral settlements often sprang from rival claims to a sacred site within the disputed territory. The ancestral hostilities between Sparta and Messenia found expression (or an excuse) in their rivalry over the sanctuary of Artemis Limnatis (**50**, **159**). Delphi, of course, was always concerned to maintain control of the holy precincts in its neighbourhood. Delphi's consistent resorts to the device of arbitration were aimed at reducing the encroachments of its neighbours, particularly Amphissa, not only on Delphi's own public land but also on the sacred land.[2] Land disputes, then, could, and often did, arise from rivalry over a sanctuary, though other conflicts involving religious jurisdiction are also reflected in the ancient evidence. Friction could arise over the right or obligation to ritual or priestly service (**4**, **11**), as it could over the privilege of hieromnemonic representation in the Amphiktyonic League (**133**, **139**, **167**).

Transgression of interstate financial agreements naturally provided opportunities for arbitration. Default on debts, fines, or other monies owing could result in an appeal to arbitration or to force, depending on the circumstances and the predisposition of the injured party. In the mid-second century Ariarathes V of Cappadocia tried to extort a sum of money from the Prienians (**143**). Ariarathes considered the money to be his as the lawful king: Priene chose to consider it the personal, rather than the public, funds of the king's half brother Orophernes. Ariarathes tried to deal with what he perceived as Prienian default by force, although the Prienians tried to have the issue settled by mediation. A more peaceful, although perhaps no more successful, attempt to settle a problem of default by arbitration was carried out by unknown arbitrators between Sparta and the Achaian League.[3] International debt was an issue that was taken seriously, and it could escalate from the private to the public level. In the fourth century a sum of money had been loaned by two individuals of Kos to the state

1. I.e., **4**, **65**, **133**, **139**, **158**.

2. See **1**, **22**, **88**, **117**, **126**. For a discussion of various arbitrations involving sacred land in Crete, see Chaniotis, *Klema*.

3. See **137**. The Spartans had a habit of not paying fines: cf. Piccirilli 53.

of Kalymna. When repayment of the loan was demanded, the Koan state took up the cause of the private creditors, and the entire matter was turned over to the arbitration of Knidos (**21**).

Throughout history there has generally existed a widespread, if rather imprecise and fluctuating, consensus about what constitutes right or "just" treatment of one state by another. Certainly there has been a sense, however subjective it might be on the part of the injured party, of what constitutes a breach of international justice. In ancient Greece, actions that constituted such a breach naturally could lead to war. But, like many issues that could find a solution in war, they were also capable of submission to arbitration. Although the ancient world did not define international law and international crimes to the same extent as does the world of the twentieth century, with its emphasis on the community of nations and the justiciable nature of war crimes, the perpetrators of hostile acts or international "crimes" could occasionally be indicted before a tribunal.

One practice, for example, that might be considered "illegal" or criminal by the state that suffered but was considered perfectly legitimate by the perpetrator was ῥύσια.[4] The raids and seizure of goods that constituted this practice were a matter for complaint on the part of the victimized state. Arbitration was a way of settling problems related to the practice of granting ῥύσια, a method that was a substitute for full-scale hostilities. Troizen and Arsinoë submitted their differences, including the question of restoration of goods seized under this practice, to the settlement of judges sent by Ptolemy VI (**138**). The right of reprisal was perceived as justifiable on the part of the state that granted it, as the only means of recovery of debt. On the other hand, the granting of this right could be perceived by the injured party as a deliberately hostile and politically motivated action. This is clear from the fact that the practice of ῥύσια could raise previously private disagreements and hostilities to national proportions. When the Achaian League granted ῥύσια to its citizens against Boiotia in 187/6, the hostilities took on a national character, and Megara was required to step in (**105**).

While the granting of ῥύσια was undoubtedly a hostile act between nations, it remained, theoretically at least, on the level of private individuals. As such it was representative of aggravated relations between states but was still capable of solution through arbitration. Less easily resolved was the outright act of aggression on the part of one state against another. When Aratos, at the head of the forces of the Achaian League, invaded Argos in peacetime, the Argive tyrant demanded due judicial process (**39**). His position was vindicated

4. τὰ ῥύσια: "the right of reprisals" (LSJ). The reference here is to the practice of a state granting its citizens the right of reprisals against the citizens of another state. The citizens of the state granting this right were thereby entitled to seize movable property from citizens of the other state as compensation for alleged theft or debt default.

by the Mantineian tribunal, but it is infrequently that we find a victim of armed aggression actually bringing a successful suit against the aggressor in an international court, for the commission of a "crime."[5]

The more frequent result of armed aggression was a declaration of war, and it is often in the settlement of a state of war that we see the intervention of a third party. In this case, it is often difficult or impossible to separate arbitration from mediation. Frequently the sources provide only the briefest of references to a third-party solution to a state of war, references that might indicate anything from mere friendly (or not so friendly) pressure to negotiate to a full-fledged judicial board prepared to correct all grievances.[6] A mediating individual or state that took the initiative in putting an end to hostilities might, if successful, go on to arbitrate the differences and negotiate a treaty between the warring states. Certainly Knidos was responsible for arbitrating the complaints outstanding from a war between Temnos and Klazomenai, as well as for establishing the treaty between them that made provision for the settlement of future disputes (**71**). Arbitration could also be employed in the institution of international agreements other than peace treaties. Antigonos I may have acted as a mediator between Teos and Lebedos in their attempted synoikism at the end of the fourth century (**13**), and the ambassadors of the Aitolian League certainly arbitrated between Messene and Phigaleia around the year 240 in order to establish a harmonious isopolity (**40**).

By far the greatest number of disputes submitted to international arbitration by the ancient Greeks consisted of quarrels over a contested piece of territory.[7] This is not surprising given the relative lack of fertile land in Greece and the fiercely independent nature of even the smallest of Greek communities. And naturally it was the fertile land that was most hotly contested, to the extent that arbitrators occasionally found it necessary to award "joint custody," and determine that the proceeds from the contested territory were to be shared by the two parties.[8] A solution such as this relieved the arbitrator of the necessity of making an unpopular judgement; but it was probably also a realistic reflection both of the limited quantity of decent land with sufficient irrigation and of the frequently doubtful or unprovable nature of the contestants' claims.

5. As opposed to having a court resolve hostilities between the two once they were actually in a state of war. In any event, the suit may not have been completely successful, as Aratos failed to appear, and the fine may never have been paid. For earlier examples of condemnations of international "crimes," see Piccirilli 6 and 17.

6. Cf. **27**, **53**, **57**, **84**, **94**, **122**, **143**.

7. Tod (p. 53) makes the point that the preponderance of arbitrations dealing with land issues is not simply an accident of our sources. He refers to the Argive-Spartan treaty of 418 (Thuc. 5.79.4): αἴτε περὶ ὅρων αἴτε περὶ τινός. For a general discussion of boundary disputes see Sartre, *Ktema* 4 (1979) pp. 213f.

8. Cf. **40** (lines 13–15): τὰν δὲ χ[ώραν καρπ]ίζεσθαι ἑκατέρως τώς τε Μεσσανίω||ς καὶ τὼς Φι]αλέας, καθὼς καὶ νῦν καρπιζόμεθα. See also **63**, **89**, **138**.

Disputes over the possession of a certain piece of territory could arise for reasons other than those motivated by the fertility of the land in question. As mentioned above, many cases of arbitration resulted from rivalry over a piece of land that contained a religious sanctuary. Territorial redistribution might also resolve a question of access to transportation routes (**85**, **138**) or decide a dispute over the ownership of land of strategic military value (**74**, **125**). The resources of the region, and the rights to them, might also be the subject of arbitration.[9] Generally the land in question was a tract bordering on the two disputant states, although occasionally it was a discrete parcel, such as an island (**3**, **158**).

On the whole, the issues involved in international disputes in antiquity bear a resemblance to many issues before international courts in the modern world. Boundary disputes, transgression of treaty obligations, feuds over access to natural resources, and various other areas of natural conflict between states provide grounds for third-party intervention today as they did in antiquity. Even altercations over territorial religious jurisdiction, so characteristic of the world of ancient Greece, have their counterpart in the twentieth century.[10]

OBLIGATORY ARBITRATION

In agreements that established close relations between states the Greeks often provided for the settlement of future disputes. This provision was particularly appropriate in the case of synoikisms or sympolities (**13**, **89**, **108**), but naturally the procedure of attaching an arbitration clause to a treaty was not restricted to such agreements. As time went on, it became ever more customary to provide for future arbitration of disagreements by attaching an obligatory arbitration clause not only to isopolitical or similar arrangements but also to other international agreements, such as alliances or peace treaties.[11] In some cases obligatory arbitration appears to have been mandated for any and all future disputes between the states (**71**). In other instances, it would be a specific issue that was to go to an arbitral settlement (**33**, **47**, **48**).

The general pattern of obligatory arbitration clauses, however, was that of a vague and general promise to turn to arbitration should it ever be required. These good intentions were enshrined in brief and imprecise clauses inserted in peace treaties, clauses without any specific provisions. Details were left to be worked out later, if arbitration proved to be necessary. Such an approach

9. Fishing rights may have been part of the issue in **17**, **83**, and **138**.

10. In 1962 the International Court of Justice arbitrated a dispute between Cambodia and Thailand over the possession of the temple of Preah Vihear and its precincts, located among the mountains that formed the boundary of the two countries.

11. The phenomenon does appear in the classical age. Athens and Sparta had such an arrangement as a result of the Thirty Years' Peace in 446/5; see Piccirilli 21. Cf. also Piccirilli 11, 25, 27, and 31.

could end in failure: the impotence of the arbitration clause in the Thirty Years' Peace Treaty is sufficient proof of that. But some treaties with an obligatory arbitration clause did take greater care to specify the procedure. In the treaty between Milētos and Herakleia it was specified that the arbitrator to be chosen would be a free and democratic city (**108**). In the case of the synoikism between Teos and Lebedos, the arbitrating state was designated by name (**13**). And when Temnos and Klazomenai drew up their treaty, they appended to it an extremely detailed catalogue of procedures to be followed in the event of future arbitration (**71**).

COMPROMISARY ARBITRATION

In the absence of a treaty providing for arbitration of interstate quarrels, two states divided on a particular issue could still agree on an ad hoc basis to refer their problem to a third party. Indeed, "compromisary" arbitration was perhaps more likely to be successful than obligatory arbitration. In the latter case, political and other circumstances had often shifted in the interim since the formulation of the original obligatory clause. One or both parties might feel no need or desire to resort to arbitration as promised.[12]

In the case of compromisary arbitration, the first steps were to open communication between the disputing states, particularly if such communication had been interrupted by a state of war. It was necessary for one or both sides to send embassies in order to bring about some form of initial agreement to go to arbitration. One party might formally invite or challenge the other to submit to arbitration (**63**, **78**). Such a challenge, initiated by one side alone, did not necessarily imply coercion or an obligation for the other party to submit to arbitration. An agreement to the invitation was necessary in order for the affair to proceed any further. Many attempts at arbitration did indeed break down at this stage through the refusal of the challenged party.[13]

In the case of a successful challenge or invitation, the representatives of both states could reach an agreement together to go to arbitration.[14] Generally the two sides would draw up a preliminary document (conventionally referred to as the *compromissum*), which would lay down guidelines for the arbitration. Various concerns would have to be resolved at this stage prior to submitting the dispute to the arbitrator. Arbitration was generally agreed to be binding; therefore it was necessary that both parties agree, *before* going to arbitration,

12. But attempts were made to ensure that both parties would adhere to the provisions of an arbitration treaty. The treaty between Sardis and Ephesos (**170**) specifically provided for a judgement in favour of the party that appeared if one party defaulted.

13. Cf. Piccirilli 23 and 38.

14. Expressed by such terms as ὁμολογέω, συνομολογέω, ὁμόνοια, εὐδοκέω, συνευδοκέω.

on the procedure and the powers to be granted to the arbitrating body. This was the function of the *compromissum*. A few of the extant documents dealing with international arbitration appear to record this preliminary agreement, rather than the final judgement.[15] It was to everyone's advantage that the *compromissum* be made public. This would reduce the chances of a potential disagreement over whether the procedure had not conformed to the agreement, or whether the arbitrator had acted *ultra vires*. It would also act as a signed statement from both parties, to the effect that they had agreed to arbitration and were therefore obliged to abide by the findings of the court.

One of the matters that would be set down in the *compromissum* was the subject of the dispute, whether it was a contested tract of land, a complaint over ῥύσια, or a problem of debt. States that resorted to arbitration were in effect surrendering their sovereignty temporarily to the arbitrator. They were, therefore, careful about defining the exact subject of dispute, as a way of delimiting the power of the arbitrator. The identity of the arbitrator was one of the most important things specified in the preliminary agreement and no doubt was frequently the result of much delicate negotiation. Both sides would have to find the choice amenable and would have to be well assured of the third state's neutrality. In one instance, the preliminary agreement specified not only the arbitrating state but also the individual to be chosen. When Phthiotic Thebes and Halos turned to Larisa for arbitration, they particularly requested that one Makon be the individual to take on the job (**153**). The specification of an individual (other than a king) in the *compromissum* is unusual, at least in the extant sources. Nevertheless, it is not unlikely that this occurred from time to time, especially in the case of the "arbitration experts," such as Nikostratos and Euphaniskos of Rhodes.[16] The more common procedure, however, was for the two states to agree on the arbitrating state, and then leave the choice of the arbitrating individual or committee up to that state.

Procedural details might also be fixed by the *compromissum* before the actual trial would take place. Certain general rules reappear throughout the history of the institution of arbitration, but in the absence of any supranational laws that would give a fixed and specific formula for universal use, procedural guidelines had to be established anew every time. When Boumelita and Halai came to submit their land dispute to Thebes, they found it necessary to agree upon certain rules in advance (**129**). This document is a particularly good illustration of the specifications that might be made with respect to the duties and responsibilities of the various officials involved. The procedure to be followed was detailed with

15. They at least reflect the compromissum if they do not actually record it *verbatim*. See **129**, **145**, **146**, **153**.

16. See **74**, **109**, **117**. Cf. **146**, where Pitane and Mytilene, when agreeing to submit to Pergamene arbitration, requested that five specific individuals, who had acted as ambassadors to the two states, also form the tribunal.

great care, down to the composition of the oaths that the judges, the advocates, and the δικαστα γοί were to swear.

The *compromissum* typically set down a time limit for the arbitration. The preliminary agreement, and with it the abeyance of hostilities, could be in effect only for a limited time. Within that time the arbitral tribunal had to be convoked and a settlement made, or, presumably, the *compromissum* would be invalidated, and a fresh set of negotiations would have to be undertaken. Halos and Thebes set a time limit to their arbitration;[17] when the Thourians and Megalopolitans resorted to the arbitration of Patrai, they not only set a time limit; they set a specific date.[18] Limits could be extended if circumstances required it; Lato and Olos gave a further six months to their Knossian arbitrators (**164**).

The decision to go to arbitration necessitated a promise to abide by the arbitrator's judgement, the "κύρια clause," which ensured the validity of the settlement.[19] Should either side default or refuse to abide by the arbitral decision a fine of some sort was a common penalty. The *compromissum* between Halos and Thebes stated that whoever should fail to accept Makon's decision was liable to pay a fine of five silver talents. A *compromissum* would also generally provide for the publication of the judgement, often at an international religious site, such as the Asklepieion at Epidauros or the sanctuary at Delphi.

ARBITRAL PROCEDURE

The first step in arbitral procedure, once an arbitration treaty was invoked or a *compromissum* reached, was for the parties concerned to invite the designated third state to perform the arbitration.[20] Occasionally the party that was to act as an arbitrator had taken the first step itself. Pitane and Mytilene agreed with one another to ask Pergamon to arbitrate their differences; when they did so, they were acting in response to an embassy from the Pergamenes themselves (**146**). Usually, however, the disputing parties made the initial request and sent embassies of their own to deliver the invitation to the prospective arbitrator.

The choice of the arbitrating state might be dictated by a preexisting treaty. A certain state could be designated as the ἔκκλητος πόλις, the city that the participants in a treaty would consult if problems should arise between them. When Antigonos I oversaw the synoikism between Teos and Lebedos he designated Mytilene as the ἔκκλητος πόλις to deal with disagreements (**13**). Ephesos and Sardis apparently worked up a roster of possible choices for an arbitrating state; when the need arose, one was to be picked by lot (**170**). But if the power

17. See **153** (lines 12–13). Cf. **146**, where it is specified that no suits between Pitane and Mytilene were to be left untried after a period of three months, and also **158**.

18. See **145** (lines 5–6).

19. See, inter al., **146**, **153**.

20. Often described in the terms ἐπιτρέπειν, ἐπιτρεπέσθαι, ἐπιτροπή.

that was to arbitrate had not been predetermined by treaty, then other factors could determine the immediate choice of the arbitrating state. Neutrality and goodwill were obviously always desirable qualities. It could also be stipulated that the arbitrating state be ideologically in sympathy with the states requesting arbitration. Thus the two disputants might agree to submit their differences to a "free and democratic" state (**108**). In order to ensure that a tribunal was truly objective, and unswayed by considerations of national interest, sometimes several different states would be invited to constitute the court.[21] The principle of a tribunal empanelled from several states is one commonly embodied in present-day international courts; but on the whole the Greeks tended to refer their disputes to a single state.

One of the most important factors in the choice of an arbitrator was the prestige of the state or individual. The more prestigious the arbitrator, the greater authority his judgement could have. The great dynasts of the Hellenistic age were often invited to act as arbitrators, and as the Greeks came to recognize the increasing power and influence of Rome in the Mediterranean, the senate was frequently petitioned by requests for arbitration. Of the independent Greek republics, Rhodes was the favoured choice and built an impressive reputation for itself in the field of mediation and arbitration through the late third and early second centuries.[22] Rhodes in this period was one of the more powerful independent Greek states and would of course have increased its prestige all the more through its successful diplomatic record.

Once an invitation to arbitrate had been made, the state petitioned to perform this service rarely refused it. It was usually the province of the arbitrating state to choose those individuals who would actually carry out the judicial procedure.[23] Generally the rationale for choosing the tribunal (δικαστήριον, κριτήριον) was based on one of two divergent ideological approaches. The choice might be made on the basis of the democratic tenet that fairness and equity were to be found by soliciting the opinion of a broad cross section of the general population. A state might designate a number of its citizens, chosen by lot, to form a court that might be several hundred in number.[24]

21. Thus Samos, Kolophon, and Magnesia arbitrated the Melitaia-Narthakion dispute (**154**). When Miletos and Magnesia settled their differences, the representatives of several states were present as mediators or arbitrators (**109**).

22. See **52**, **53**, **57**, **63**, **74**, **77**, **94**, **109**, **117**, **119**, **121**, **124**. See Ager, *Historia* 40 (1991).

23. The κριταί or δικασταί, less frequently διαιτηταί, διαιτοί (**153**).

24. In some cases the arbitral decision is said to have been made by the δῆμος of a democratic city-state. Perhaps the decision might be submitted to the state assembly. See **3**, **64**, **100**. Tod argued (p. 100) that these references mean a large court representative of the δῆμος; for the opposite view, see Raeder, p. 254.

For large courts, see **21** (204), **23** (600?), **28** (61), **36** (over 59), **46** (exact number unknown but apparently high), **83** (301), **109** (13 states involved: cf. **48**), **159** (600). Such a large court not only served the perceived need for democratic equity; it was also proof against bribery. In these

The other approach embodied the principle of expertise rather than equity. In many cases we find a small tribunal, which was more likely to be elected or appointed than chosen by lot.[25] The individuals might be chosen for general aristocratic reasons, or because they had actual diplomatic or specific arbitral experience.[26] Smaller commissions such as these were more conducive to an arbitration taking place in the territory of the disputing cities; and in the case of a land dispute, it was much easier to show the territory to a small number of people.[27] The need for examination by autopsy might therefore be a decisive factor in the size of the tribunal. Although the evidence is scanty, it is not unlikely that one man might be chosen to act as president of any tribunal numbering more than two or three individuals.[28]

Once the arbitrating state had accepted the responsibility and delegated the authority to a tribunal, the venue of the trial was the next concern. The judgement would sometimes take place in the arbitrating state itself. Certainly in the case of the Hellenistic dynasts, the monarch himself was unlikely to visit the states in dispute, although he might dispatch a representative to take over the case.[29] Philip V appointed deputies to settle the details of a territorial contest between Herakleion and Gonnoi (**54**); but when Lysimachos arbitrated between Samos and Priene, embassies from both states apparently contested their claims at Lysimachos's court (**26**). The overall pattern of Roman arbitration was twofold: the senate would often listen to claims and counterclaims put before it in Rome and then either dispatch legates to investigate the matter in detail on the spot or else delegate an independent state

---

circumstances, it was not unusual for the trial to take place in the arbitrating state; the trouble and expense of transporting such a large number of people would have been overwhelming.

25. For smaller tribunals, see **30** (5), **33** (20), **40** (3), **56** (3), **63** (6), **71** (6), **74** (5).

26. Those who were to perform the arbitration between Pagai and Aigosthena were described as [αἱρε]τοὺς πλουτίνδα καὶ ἀριστίνδα (**85**). Cf. **137**: [αἱρήσε|σθαι ἐκ πά]ντων ἀριστίνδαν. In the latter case, where the judges are said to be drawn "from all," the "excellence" referred to should be one of quality rather than birth. For a larger tribunal that may still have embodied some "oligarchic" tendencies, see the speculations in **38**.

The Rhodians Nikostratos and Euphaniskos were probably chosen for their experience and proven ability in arbitration (**74**, **109**, **117**). The well-known individuals who appear in **116**—Diophanes, Thearidas, Polybios—would have been selected to arbitrate in their capacity as statesmen.

27. This is clearly shown in **38**, where the initial court numbered 151 judges; however, when it came time for a more detailed survey of the land in dispute, a select commission of 31 men was chosen.

28. See **118** (μνάμων, συνδικασταί), and the positions apparently held by Pausanias (**22**) and Pyllos (**32**).

29. An obvious exception is Alexander the Great, who apparently settled disputes, probably more than our sources record, in the course of his expedition. See **6**, **74**.

to give judgement, usually after laying down a general rule about the point of law.[30]

Roman senators and Hellenistic monarchs, who might be expected to stand on their prestige, were not the only arbitrators to hear cases in their home state. The tribunals that consisted of several hundred individuals were likely to try a case in their own state; when the δῆμος is said to have voted in an arbitration it is virtually certain that the vote took place in the arbitrating state. The court of 600 Milesians that judged the conflicting claims of the Spartans and Messenians heard the case in Miletos (**159**). But one or two cases indicate that "long-distance" judging was thought to be unsatisfactory in some instances. When Smyrna handed down a decision on a boundary dispute between Priene and Miletos, it did so by a collective vote of the people of Smyrna as a whole. There was apparently no firsthand investigation of the site, and the evidence we have suggests that a further boundary commission was required to settle outstanding problems (**100**). When Megara arbitrated a conflict between Corinth and Epidauros, the large court of 151 judges was apparently able to carry out only the briefest of on-site inspections. Corinth was dissatisfied with the results, and Megara had to send a smaller commission of 31 men to carry out a more detailed boundary delineation (**38**).

Megara's decision between Corinth and Epidauros demonstrates a common pattern in the choice of venue for the trial. In cases of boundary arbitration, by far the largest group of arbitrations, the judges would usually see over the land and visit the states in question, but the final judgement might be given elsewhere. When Pergamon arbitrated between Pitane and Mytilene, the judges visited the contested territory and then gave judgement at home in Pergamon (**146**). In the case of the Rhodian arbitration between Samos and Priene, evidence was heard in numerous venues: at Rhodes, on the land itself, and finally at Ephesos (**74**).

No matter where the final decision in a boundary arbitration was given, the trial usually necessitated some travel, since the tribunal generally acted as a boundary commission. Judges were asked to make not only legal, but also topographic, decisions. In certain instances the topographic debate would be minimal or nonexistent: when Argos decided a territorial conflict between Melos and Kimolos, it was simply a matter of coming to a legal decision about who had the right to the three small islands in dispute (**3**). Usually, however, the tribunal would have to delineate in detail the border between the two states,[31] a duty that naturally entailed a visit to the land in question. Since autopsy was often

30. Such as the rule with which Roman and Roman-delegated arbitrators were frequently asked to comply: that a piece of contested territory be adjudged to the state that was proved to have been in possession of it when the states in question entered into friendship or alliance with Rome. See **120**, **156**.

31. Hence the reference to the judges as γαοδικαί (**20**, **41**), ὁρισταί (**100**), τερμαστῆρες (**38**), and the occasional employment of a γεωμέτρης (**54**).

required, it is not surprising to find that geographical proximity might also be a factor in the choice of arbitrator.

It was the duty of the states that had requested the arbitration to arrange for the conveyance, escort, and accommodation of the tribunal, in order for them to carry out their survey of the land.[32] Protection of the judges was the responsibility of the state or states that had requested their presence. The Delphians took great care that the security of certain Rhodian judges whom they had invited should be guaranteed.[33] Safe escort of the judges was often the province of officials known as δικαταγωγοί.[34] It was the obligation of the δικαταγωγοί to convey the judges from their home state to the venue of the tribunal, to provide for their accommodation and comfort, and to see them safely home again. But they might also have the further responsibility of ensuring not only that the judges would be safe when they arrived at their destination but also that they would be uncorrupted by bribes. The δικαταγωγοί sent to escort the judges of Thebes who were to arbitrate between Halai and Boumelita swore an oath that they had carried out their duties correctly, and that they had neither bribed the judges themselves nor allowed anyone else the opportunity to do so (**129**).

In boundary arbitrations, the survey of the disputed territory could take place either before or after the hearing of evidence. In the interest of objectivity, the judges would generally be escorted over the land by the advocates of both sides. There might be one joint survey, or two separate surveys to allow the judges to listen to the arguments of each side separately.[35] Occasionally there appears to be an exception to the rule that both disputants should have a chance to escort the judges over the territory. When judges from Kassandreia came to Thessaly to give judgement on a border dispute between Peuma, on the one hand, and Pereia and Phylladon, on the other, it appears as though Peumatan representatives may not have been present at the boundary survey (**31**).

Surveys of the disputed land in territorial cases allowed the advocates of the disputing states to argue their case on the spot and also no doubt made the judges' task easier when it came time to draw the boundaries. Outside of these inspections, arbitral trials conformed to fairly standard legal procedures. The court, wherever it was convened, would listen to the arguments of both sides. Both disputants in the case would employ advocates to plead their cause before the tribunal.[36] Several of the documents that provide evidence for arbitral cases

32. The ἐφήγηcιc (**129**), περιήγηcιc (**1**, **30**, **31**, **44**, **55**, **63**, **118**, **129**), ὑφήγηcιc (**88**). On αὐτοψία, see **88**.

33. See **117** (I, lines 32–33): [ἐ]πιμεληθῆμεν δὲ τοὺc ἄ[ρχοντας τᾶc| ἀ]cφαλείας αὐτῶν ὅπως παραπεμφθέωντι ἄχρι οὗ κα [αὐτοῖc δοκῇ].

34. See **63**, **129**. Cf. **120** (I, line 23): τῶν δικαcτοφυλακηcάντων ἀνδρῶν.

35. See **63**, **118**. For separate surveys, see **129**.

36. cύνδικοc (**19**, **137**), cυνήγοροc (**71**), δικαιολογηθέντεc (**120**), προδικέοντεc (**125**).

consist of decrees of gratitude for these advocates (**80**, **117**, **169**). Individuals who pleaded a state's case or oversaw its interests in a trial were not necessarily citizens of the state concerned. The Delphians promulgated a decree of formal thanks for the Athenian Apollodoros, who acted as an advocate for Delphi in their dispute with Amphissa (**117**), and in the dispute between Abdera and Kotys of Thrace the Abderan case was presented to Roman senators by Teian ambassadors (**169**). Part of the advocates' task might be to escort the tribunal on its visit to the disputed land and present the claims of their state on the spot. In the formal trial it would be the advocates' duty to present the evidence and delineate the arguments in a legal speech before the tribunal. Their speeches could be strictly controlled in terms of length (**21**).

Varying types of evidence were produced in arbitral trials. We are once again most well informed when it comes to boundary arbitrations. Evidence could consist of the verbal witness of locals, sworn depositions, documents from the state archives, inscriptions citing past agreements and treaties, notices in historical writings, and even citations of ancient legend. Some of the more extensive inscriptions provide us with the actual verbatim testimony of certain witnesses, given in the first person as it would have been given at the trial. When Kondaia disputed a piece of land with a neighbour, the final publication of the proceedings was very detailed and cited together all the evidence that Kondaia had produced in its favour (**70**). A local shepherd named Ladikos offered his testimony, asserting that he was very well acquainted with the land, since he had pastured his flocks there, and knew Kondaia to have a good claim to it. Similarly the herder Menippos was a witness in the case of a conflict between Gonnoi and Herakleion (**54**). If a witness was unable to appear in person, he might make a sworn deposition in his own state, which would then be sealed and conveyed to the court.[37] Copies of inscriptions or state documents might also be sent under sealed cover to prevent tampering. When the Messenians argued their case against Sparta before Tiberius in A.D. 25, they employed inscriptional evidence and would no doubt have been able to produce copies on the spot.[38] The case of Sparta and Messene also demonstrates that not all the evidence adduced was equally reliable, and that appeals to sentiment might play as large a role as reason. The Messenian advocates cited the ancient legends of the Herakleidai, and the Spartans the evidence of the poets. In an arbitration of the archaic period, Athens put forth the evidence of Homer, in order to advance its claim to Salamis.[39] Sparta also offered the evidence of historical writers in the trial before Tiberius. Similar use of historical writings appears in the arguments

37. See the procedure in **21** and **71**; cf. also **28** and, for examples of documentary evidence, **146**.

38. See **50** and **159**.

39. Piccirilli 10. Compare Megalopolis's claim that its rightful tenure of a piece of disputed land went back to the "return of the Herakleidai" (**137**).

of Samos and Priene before Lysimachos early in the third century, and before Rhodes early in the second (**26**, **74**). In the latter case, the arbitrators were not only to listen to evidence based on the historians but were also called upon to make value judgements as to the quality and reliability of the historical writings cited as evidence.[40]

In making their judgements, arbitral tribunals were theoretically obliged to practice the strictest impartiality and justice. Judges' oaths to this effect were probably a standard feature of the pretrial procedure.[41] When the Knidian judges gave their decision in favour of Kalymna, they were sworn to abide by an oath they had taken before hearing the evidence:

> I swear by Zeus and Apollo Lykios and the Earth that I shall pass judgement on these matters, concerning which the disputants have sworn their complaints, in accordance with the opinion which seems most just; I shall not give judgement in accordance with a witness if he should not appear to have given truthful evidence; nor have I received any bribe for the sake of this suit, neither I myself nor anyone else, man or woman, for me, not by any means. If I keep my oath, may it go well for me; if I break it, may it go ill.[42]

In the case of a dispute between Halai and Boumelita, which was a disagreement over land, part of the judges' oath declared that they would examine the land in person and establish the boundary in a straight line in accordance with their judgement (**129**).

The justice and fairness exercised by tribunals are much stressed in the honorary decrees frequently promulgated following a trial. This is hardly surprising given that these decrees, offering various honours such as *proxenia* to the judges, are invariably decrees passed by the victorious state. No doubt the state that lost might have a different view of the matter. In this connection it is interesting to note the decree passed by Delphi, expressing gratitude to a set of Rhodian judges, which appears to stress Rhodian partiality in favour of the Delphians (**117**).

Prior to giving a binding arbitral decision, it was often the responsibility of an arbitration tribunal to try to bring about a mediated settlement.[43] The duty of Rhodian judges appointed to effect a settlement between Priene and Samos is said to have been "to judge and delineate the boundary and declare a formal

40. On the use of historians for evidence, see A. Chaniotis, *Historie und Historiker in den griechischen Inschriften* (Stuttgart, 1988) passim.

41. We have already seen that the δικαστα γοι might have to swear an oath. That advocates might also have to do so is clear from **71** and **129**.

42. Case **21** (I B, lines 27–32). On the δικαιοτάτη γνώμη, see I. Triantaphyllopoulos, in *Antologia giuridica romanistica ed antiquaria* I (Milan, 1968) pp. 51–62.

43. διαλλαγή, cύλλυcιc. Although there is not always an absolute distinction with respect to the use of these terms, the λύω/λύcιc compounds generally reflect reconciliation rather than formal judgement.

decision or to reconcile" (**74**). The unknown arbitrators who judged between the Achaian League and Sparta apparently tried to bring about a reconciliation but were defeated in this task by the long history of hostility (**137**). Hostility such as this may account for the fact that reconciliation prior to judgement seems to have been a phenomenon more common to the institution of foreign judges invited to settle suits between citizens of the same state than to that of international arbitration.[44] Perhaps in the former case the parties in dispute were perceived to have more interests in common. In the event that informal reconciliation between states should prove to be impossible, an arbitral court would go on to give a formal and theoretically binding judgement.[45] When the judges who arbitrated between Sparta and the Achaian League were defeated in their efforts to reconcile the two parties, they were forced to go ahead and make an arbitral decision properly speaking (**137**). This is arbitration in its purest form, when the judges hand down a formal judicial decision binding on both parties.

In cases not involving a land claim, the final decision of the judges might take the form of a monetary award. When Aristippos, the tyrant of Argos, accused Aratos and the Achaian League of perpetrating a hostile act in time of peace the Mantineian arbitrators found against Aratos (apparently through default) and demanded that a fine of 30 mnai be paid (**39**). Judgement could be given in the form of an acquittal or condemnation of the accused party in the case. When Hypata and Erythrai accepted Chalkis as an arbitrator of their dispute, the Chalkidian judges formally acquitted the Hypatans of the charge of having wrongfully occupied a certain territory.[46]

In the case of Hypata and Erythrai the land that Hypata had occupied was the contentious issue. The judges simply ruled that Hypata be acquitted of the charge and therefore allowed to keep the land. This arbitration over disputed territory therefore falls into the category of those land arbitrations where a simple and straightforward decision was required. The land itself was already clearly defined (as is the case with disputes involving islands), and the only task of the judges was to decide which party had the better claim to it. A large number of land arbitration cases, however, required the judges to act also as border delineators. The final publication of their judgement reflects this aspect of their duties.[47] It was often required that the boundary be drawn in as straight a line as possible, where the topography allowed.[48] Naturally this

44. See Tod, pp. 124f.

45. ἀπόφαcιc, ἀπόκριμα, διάκριcιc, ἐπίκριcιc, κρίμα, κρίcιc.

46. See 125 (I, lines 8–10): ἀπολελυμ[έναν]| εἶμεν τὰμ πόλιν τῶν Ὑπαταίω[ν τοῦ]| ἐγκλήματος. Hypata was the defendant city (ἀπόδικος πόλις).

47. The tribunal's work is often described in such terms as ἀφορίζω, ἀφορισμός, διορίζω, ὁρίζω, ὁρισμός, περιορίζω, περιορισμός, τερμάζω, τερμονίζω, τερμονισμός.

48. εὐθύς: **40**, **74**, **88**, **116**, **129**; εὐθυωρία: **41**, **63**; ὀρθός: **1**, **82**, **126**, **128**.

was sometimes impossible. A frequent compromise was to have the boundary line follow a watercourse.[49] The border would be described in terms of the significant landmarks along its route. Natural features of the landscape were the most common choice of landmarks for a boundary delineation: various bodies of water, cliffs, hills, ridges, and gullies. Artificial objects could also provide landmarks: roads, temples or other structures, graves, altars, or the borders of a neighbouring state. In certain cases, the features that appear in the boundary delineation were the actual objects of the litigation, and the boundary was then drawn so as to award the object, such as a temple, to the territory of the winning side. If the land was to be owned or harvested jointly by the two states, this arrangement would also find expression in the final sentence of the judges.[50]

Issues other than boundary delineations were settled by the final judgements of arbitrators. In cases where a neutral tribunal adjusted the affairs of states that had been at war, its final decision would set out the terms of the peace settlement. The Knidian judges who helped to regulate affairs between Temnos and Klazomenai after a war between the two laid down the rules to be followed by both states in order to implement a state of peace (**71**). In instances such as this, the arbitrators might insist on a dismissal of opposing claims, and the institution of an ἀμνηστία.[51]

Once the arbitrators had made their decision they had to ensure the validity of their judgement, and institute safeguards to guarantee its execution. One important step was to provide for the publication of the award through inscription. Generally both parties to the dispute would receive copies of the award, and it would be up to them to inscribe it publicly; but the victor in the contest was the more likely actually to carry out such a public inscription. We have no certain copies of awards from states who did not fare well in an arbitral trial, and the case of Priene is instructive in this regard. The temple of Athena Polias at Priene was home to a number of inscriptions that published the details of several successful (for Priene) arbitrations of the land dispute between that state and Samos. But nowhere among the extensive epigraphic discoveries from the Athena temple are there examples of Prienian defeats, even though we know from other evidence that Samos was occasionally the victor in this ongoing judicial conflict.[52]

In addition to publication in the interested cities, the judgement was frequently published at a neutral international site of some importance, generally a

49. ὡς ὕδωρ ῥεῖ: **1**, **16**, **18**, **31**, **56**, **63**, **74**, **126**, **128**.

50. See **63**, and see Daverio Rocchi, pp. 37–40 (on κοιναὶ χῶραι).

51. For the ἀμνηστία, see **71**, **108**, **109**.

52. For the inscriptions from the Athena temple, see **74**, **99**, **100**, **160**. At Priene there was no copy of the Lysimacheian award favouring Samos (**26**), and no contemporary reference to the Roman award (**99**) that did the same.

sanctuary. Hence many documents recording arbitration come from the great international religious sites such as Delphi or the Asklepieion at Epidauros. States that had helped to mediate or arbitrate an agreement between others would also generally have their own copy of the final treaty. The first-century treaty between Ephesos and Sardis, mediated by Pergamon, was discovered in the ruins of the latter state (**170**).

Certain safeguards might be set down by the judges in order to ensure the validity of their award. The "κύρια clause" has already been mentioned. This declaration that the judgement be valid for all time could be enhanced by preventive rulings in anticipation of future challenges. Anyone who challenged or caused an infraction of the judgement might be liable to pay damages, often an amount predetermined at the time of arbitration. Once Arsinoë and Troizen had settled their differences, no further litigation was to take place between the two states on certain matters. If any attempt was made to do so, either by a state or by an individual, the perpetrator would be fined a fixed amount: 1,000 drachmai for an individual, 10,000 drachmai for a city.[53] Halos and Thebes in Phthiotis agreed that a 5-talent fine should be paid if either city refused to accept the judgement of Makon or failed to abide by his decision after it had been finalized (**153**).

Oaths were a natural part of the procedure to secure adherence to the decision of the arbitrators. Promises would be made at the time of the *compromissum* to abide by the judges' findings. An additional safeguard might be found in the presence of neutral witnesses, invited in order to guarantee and bear witness to the commitments made by all parties. The *synedrion* of the Aitolian League acted as witness and guarantor of a settlement made between Melitaia and Pereia by arbitrators from Kalydon (**56**), and witnesses from Melitaia guaranteed the security of the agreement between Halos and Thebes (**153**).

ARBITRATION IN THE HELLENISTIC AGE

When the evidence for international arbitration from the years after the institution of the League of Corinth is compared with that from the earlier period of Greek history, it becomes clear that Greek arbitration was a much more frequent phenomenon in the Hellenistic age than in the classical period.[54] To a certain extent the increase in frequency is only apparent. Much of our evidence relies on epigraphic sources, which are more abundant for the later period. The fact that we have far more inscriptions recording cases of arbitration from the Hellenistic age than the classical is not necessarily a reliable yardstick for measuring the increased frequency of arbitration.

53. See **138**; cf. **42**.

54. Piccirilli counted only sixty-one instances between c. 740 and 338 B.C.

On the other hand, there are additional factors that would account for more extensive employment of arbitration in the later period. The fourth century, with the introduction of the notion of κοινὴ εἰρήνη, the "common peace," was obviously moving in the direction of an increased interest in the diplomatic settlement of disputes and safeguards against the outbreak of war.[55] The greater procedural and legislative detail in the later epigraphic documents indicates that the phenomenon of arbitration was being gradually refined as years went by. This may again be an apparent rather than an actual development, since epigraphic sources of all types tend to be much more detailed in the Hellenistic age than in the classical. But with every successful case of interstate arbitration, there were more precedents set, and those who turned to arbitration in the Hellenistic period could be assured that they were about to make use of a well-established practice, with numerous precedents, and much experience upon which to draw.

Another factor that would account for increased dependence on international arbitration in the Hellenistic age was the new political atmosphere of these centuries. In 446/5 Athens and Sparta put an arbitration clause into the treaty that put an end to the First Peloponnesian War. Nevertheless, when tensions between the two states increased prior to the outbreak of war again in 431, a judicial settlement of their differences, although suggested, was ignored by Sparta. In part, this was because Sparta felt that the problems were too grave and threatening to be settled by this method; they were matters of "vital interest."[56] But another factor no doubt intervened: the lack of a suitable arbitrator. Sparta and Athens were the two great powers of the day, and it is difficult to see where they could have found an arbitrator prestigious enough to enforce a judicial decision.

The Hellenistic Monarchs and Arbitration

In the Hellenistic age the political pattern of the Greek world was entirely different. This was the period of the great dynasts of the Hellenistic kingdoms. These monarchs, following in the footsteps of Philip II and Alexander the Great, frequently acted in the capacity of arbitrators. There are certain scanty parallels from the earlier period. Of the Greek tyrants, only Periander of Corinth is known to have acted as an arbitrator, deciding a dispute between Athens and Mytilene over the possession of Sigeion. Persian royal power was occasionally implemented to bring about arbitration. In the early fifth century, Artaphernes called on the Ionians to make arbitral arrangements with one another; in the

55. Cf. Piccirilli 46 and 48.

56. Sparta was notoriously unwilling to accept offers of arbitration, or, if forced to do so, it often refused to accept the validity of the judgement. See Piccirilli 1, 38, 53; and **50**, **135**, **136**, **137**, **150**, and **159** in this volume.

fourth, Strouses took part in an arbitration between Miletos and Myos.[57] But from the age of the tyrants down to the Hellenistic period, Greece was for the most part the world of the polis, not of the powerful dynastic individual. It was with Alexander and the Hellenistic monarchs that the political shape of the Greek world shifted, and the institution of third-party diplomacy, like so many other institutions, was greatly affected.

Tod remarked that "in Alexander and his successors the Greeks found men most of whom possessed some powers of statesmanship, a sincere desire to settle the internal feuds which threatened the peace and stability of their empires, an unbiased judgement, a willingness to take pains in the investigation of the disputes brought before them, and the power requisite to secure effectiveness for their awards."[58] Yet Tod's view of the Hellenistic monarch as the epitome of the perfect arbitrator strikes the reader as rather rosy. Certainly the king's own self-interest should be emphasized; Ptolemy II's dubious offer to mediate between Rome and Carthage was motivated by a desire to extricate himelf from a rather awkward diplomatic situation (**35**). And it could be asked whether the Teians and Lebedians, when they underwent their enforced synoikism at the behest of Antigonos I (**13**), were particularly impressed with his sincerity and unbiased judgement.

On the other hand, it would be overly sceptical to assert that the monarchs took a wholly cynical approach to the institution. The extant evidence for royal arbitrations suggests that the kings took the task seriously and invested in it an appropriate amount of their own time, or that of their subordinates. This becomes all the more noticeable when we compare royal action in cases of arbitration with the often minimal action taken by the Romans when they found themselves in the same position.

As far as the monarchs' qualifications are concerned, Tod's summation has a fair amount of validity. Power and prestige, as discussed earlier, are vital characteristics for an arbitrator. A garrison would not necessarily have to be stationed in a small polis to ensure that it abided by the agreement made with its neighbour; the potential of action would be enough. Furthermore, the relationship between king and polis, particularly in Asia Minor, was in some ways conducive to the arbitral method of settling disputes between poleis. A polis might be "independent" and yet still be situated in territory more or less controlled by a monarch. The monarch was a neutral power outside the borders of the feuding states, but also a permanent presence to remind the parties of their agreement. From the king's point of view, it would often be a utilitarian method of achieving what he wanted (general peace and stability), without creating friction with the city-states.

57. Periander: Piccirilli 7; Artaphernes: Piccirilli 11; Strouses: Piccirilli 36. Cf. also the actions of Medeios I of Larisa (Piccirilli 35; cf. **156**) and Amyntas III of Macedon (Piccirilli 40).

58. Tod, p. 180.

Occasionally the Hellenistic kings tried to transfer the techniques of mediation to the larger world of international politics, offering to settle disputes involving Rome, Carthage, or other Hellenistic monarchies. In 280 Pyrrhos of Epiros offered to act as an arbitrator to bring about a peace between Rome and the Italian Greeks (**27**). The Romans rejected this offer, as they did that of Ptolemy II during the First Punic War (**35**). For the most part royal arbitration was more successful and more suitable to the world of the city-states now overshadowed by the monarchies. During the years that Lysimachos controlled Thrace and Asia Minor he carried out what was evidently an unbiased and ultimately successful arbitration between Priene and Samos (**26**). The issue was a piece of mainland territory long coveted by both sides; although territorial disputes between Priene and Samos arose again and again throughout the Hellenistic period, it seems that the arbitration of Lysimachos was the final word on at least part of the contested region. The judges of Ptolemy VI were also successful in their arbitration of a variety of matters dividing the Troizenians and Arsinoeians (**138**).

When we examine some of the fuller ancient documents it is obvious that the process of arbitration—the hearing of evidence, the examination of disputed land, and so on—could be enormously time-consuming. Clearly, monarchs could not always be expected to arbitrate personally. Sometimes they did do so: when the Prienians and Samians argued their claims to the Batinetis, they evidently did so in front of Lysimachos himself (**26**). More commonly, it would be the representatives and subordinates of the king who would carry out the actual task of arbitration. Sometimes the monarch's deputies may have acted with a fair amount of freedom; often, however, they would act in accordance with a generalized outline provided by the king, an outline that contained certain basic rules with respect to procedure or the final decision. This is the royal διάγραμμα. Philip V's representatives employed the king's διάγραμμα in carrying out an arbitration between Gonnoi and Herakleion (**54**); and when the Koans came to arbitrate between Teos and Klazomenai, they may have done so in keeping with a διάγραμμα of Antigonos I (**15**).

Arbitration and Federal States

Most of the successful arbitrations carried out by Hellenistic monarchs were decisions that affected the city-states attached to their own realms, or at least within their sphere of influence. But the monarchs were not the only suprapolitical power of the Hellenistic age. In mainland Greece the federal leagues balanced the power of the new monarchies and also played a vital role in arbitration between states. Although the *koinon* had already a long-standing history in Greece by the Hellenistic age, this was the time, on the Greek mainland, when the federal states attained greater significance. This fact must be connected with the political realities of the time. No longer could the small polis

hope to continue as a fully independent state in an age of great powers. Border wars between small states became a less viable method of settling disputes when the great powers might be waiting in the background to take advantage of the situation. Instead, some kind of strong mutual support system among the poleis was required.

Federal jurisdiction over member states influenced the patterns of international arbitration in the Hellenistic age. First and most important, of course, was general league refusal to tolerate active hostilities between its members. Thus the mere fact of membership in one of the leagues would tend to divert a polis from making war to seeking a pacific method of settlement. In the fourth century, with the establishment of the κοινὴ εἰρήνη, Greek states participating in the "common peace" were expected to honour its conditions. As time went on, common peace agreements incorporated guarantees of collective action in the case of a breach of the peace. The guarantees of joint military action against an aggressor could be further expanded to include provisions for peaceful settlement of disputes between cosignatories. The available evidence suggests that both the League of Corinth and the Hellenic League of the Antigonids incorporated into their constitutions provisions for arbitration of disputes between members of the alliance (**2**, **14**). These organizations were not true territorial leagues in the same sense as the Achaian or Aitolian League, but during the period of their existence they provided a transnational body to which states could bring their grievances.[59] Complaints would evidently go to the *synedrion*, and, under some circumstances, the *synedrion* would make direct judgements. But the *synedrion* could also delegate the task of decision making. The dispute between the islands of Melos and Kimolos, probably submitted to the League of Corinth, was passed on to the state of Argos for arbitration (**3**).

It seems, then, that the councils of the two Greek "leagues" constructed by the Macedonian rulers in the latter part of the fourth century were empowered, at least in certain cases, either to arbitrate themselves or to pass on the task to another state that was a member of the alliance. Similar patterns can be discerned in the operation of the major and minor territorial leagues of the Hellenistic period. We have some (admittedly rather vague) evidence that suggests that the Boiotian League settled disputes between its members directly, perhaps through the auspices of the federal council. Two inscriptions that refer to arbitrations within the Boiotian League speak of contested land being delineated by "the Boiotians" (**16**, **17**). The land dispute between Melitaia and

59. It might be thought that the organization of the Delphic Amphiktyony would also provide such a body; the operation of the Amphiktyonic League, however, was largely restricted to matters concerning Delphi directly. In the Hellenistic age, at any rate, its chief function with respect to arbitration was the settlement of border disagreements between Delphi and its neighbours (**1**, **88**, **163**). See the discussion in G. Roux, *L'Amphictionie, Delphes et le temple d'Apollon* (Lyon, 1979) pp. 53f.

Narthakion, a dispute arbitrated by the Thessalian League in the fourth century, was probably settled by the same body after its reconstitution in 196 (**79**). The vague references these inscriptions make to "the Boiotians" or "the Thessalians" do not necessarily mean that the arbitration was carried out by some organ of the federal government; but the inscription containing the Melitaia-Narthakion document is certainly specific enough when it comes to the names of other arbitrators. It seems likely that a reference to "the Thessalians" does in fact mean that the arbitration was carried out by a League body or League officials. Other minor leagues may also have heard disputes between their members directly.[60]

The Achaian League, however, had a tendency to delegate the task of arbitration rather than convoke the *synedrion* as a tribunal. It is not impossible that the Achaians envisioned making a direct decision on an outstanding dispute between Megalopolis and Orchomenos, on the occasion of the latter's entrance into League membership (**43**). But for the most part the evidence suggests that the Achaian League was happy to request a member state to carry out the arbitration. Megara arbitrated between Corinth and Epidauros (**38**), Patrai between Thouria and Megalopolis (**145**). Sometimes the task of arbitration went to a tribunal constituted by more than one state: an arbitration between Arsinoë and Epidauros may have been carried out by representatives from eleven Achaian cities (**46**). As far as we can tell, these delegated arbitrators were able to function with a fair amount of freedom. There is no evidence that the League reserved any basic decisions on points of law, as the Roman senate was wont to do when it delegated a Greek arbitrator.

The Aitolian League, on the other hand, may have retained a somewhat more direct role in arbitration between its members. Although we do not find the Aitolian *synedrion* actively carrying out arbitrations between member states as a matter of course, it does seem that on more than one occasion the League council was responsible for choosing individual delegates directly to fulfill these functions, rather than handing over the task to a member state. The Aitolian representatives who facilitated the isopolity between Phigaleia and Messenia were empowered by a decree of the League and were not publicly given any other ethnic designation than that of Aitolians (**40**). Similarly, the Aitolian judges who arbitrated between Melitaia and Xyniai in 214/3 were chosen directly by the League (**55**); the Kalydonians who travelled to that region the next year to effect a sympolity between Melitaia and Pereia were again the direct nominees of the Aitolian League. The Aitolian *synedrion*, furthermore, loaned its services as a witness to that agreement.

It is safe to state that federal leagues were generally involved in most arbitrations between their members; in some cases that involvement was obviously

60. See **81** (the Lakedaimonian *koinon*) and **130** (the Lycian *koinon*).

more profound than in others. But did the leagues institute permanent bodies that could act as federal courts of arbitration? On the whole, the answer seems to be no. There is little in the way of any positive indication that interstate arbitration within any *koinon* was ever of sufficient frequency or on such a scale as to warrant the development of a permanent arbitral court. For the most part, interstate arbitration in antiquity was dealt with on an ad hoc basis, at least as far as the constitution of tribunals went. This holds true within the leagues as well. Polybios does tell us that there were federal courts in the Achaian League (2.37.10-11); but his emphasis on a federal judicial system seems exaggerated given that we find the federal judges acting only once, to condemn a magistrate to death.[61] So permanent federal courts for interstate arbitration do not seem to have played a role in the constitution of the Greek leagues; this does not mean, however, that the leagues were insensitive to the utility of arbitration within their own spheres. In fact, arbitration of outstanding disputes, or at least an undertaking to arbitrate them, may have been a prerequisite to membership in the Achaian League. Orchomenos was required to agree to submit its quarrel with Megalopolis to arbitration when it joined the League (**43**); Epidauros may have faced similar requirements (**38**).

It has generally been assumed that international arbitration involving the members of a federal league must necessarily have been carried out under the auspices of that league.[62] The evidence in most cases certainly indicates that league involvement was natural when hostilities arose among the member states. It was also natural for the league to be involved when the dispute was between one of its member states and a state belonging to another league. Thus the potential arbitration envisioned between the Akarnanian community of Stratos and Aitolian Agrai was to be regulated by a joint Aitolian-Akarnanian commission (**33**). When Pagai, an Achaian state, and Aigosthena, a member of the Boiotian League, had a territorial dispute, both the Achaian and Boiotian leagues stepped in to act as advocates of their respective states and referred the issue to Western Greek states, outside the provenance of both leagues entirely (**85**). Nevertheless, although we might normally expect the official machinery of the leagues to be at work in the settlement of members' disputes, this was not invariably the case. When Hermione and Epidauros were engaged in a border conflict, they decided between themselves to invite a commission from Rhodes and Miletos (**63**). There is no evidence of the official involvement of the Achaian

61. Polyb. 38.18.3. Walbank (*Comm*, vol. 1, p. 220; vol. 3, p. 716) points out that the Achaian federal assembly could and did frequently function as a court. But as far as interstate arbitration goes, we rarely find Achaian courts, councils, or assemblies functioning as arbitrators. See Ager, *JHS* 114 (1994) pp. 1–18, for a discussion of the Cretan κοινοδίκιον, the putative tribunal of the Cretan koinon. See also **130**, and Larsen's belief that the Lycian federal court arbitrated between two member states.

62. See in particular Raeder; Swoboda, *Klio* 12 (1912) pp. 17–50.

League.[63] And while the League may have required its new members to arbitrate their outstanding disputes, there is no evidence that it required an undertaking to submit all *future* disputes to League arbitration. J. A. O. Larsen points out that the *symbolon* treaty between Stymphalos and Aigira, both members of the Achaian League, nowhere refers to that membership. Judicial matters were to be dealt with by arbitrators and the foreign courts of the two states themselves.[64]

It is probably safe to assert, however, that although there are some significant exceptions, the majority of arbitrations among members of a federal league probably involved the league itself in some capacity. Certainly the leagues played an important role in encouraging and refining the procedure of arbitration in the Hellenistic age.

Rome and Arbitration

The other great power that appeared in the Mediterranean world in the Hellenistic age was Rome. Once the Greeks recognized the importance of this non-Greek state in Greek affairs, they turned to it increasingly as the arbitrator of their disputes. The heyday of the Hellenistic kingdoms had been the third century, prior to Rome's appearance on the horizon as a power important in the East as well as in the West. From the end of the third century on, however, Rome's increasing influence in the eastern Mediterranean can be traced in the patterns of arbitration and mediation. The watershed was the wars at the turn of the century with Philip and Antiochos.

On the whole, Rome took a rather minimalist approach to its new position as the prime candidate for international arbitrator.[65] The initiative generally came from the Greek states, whether it was Melitaia and Narthakion seeking another final solution to their interminable dispute (**156**), or Eumenes asking Rome to step in on his behalf yet again.[66] Rome never displayed any real interest in developing a detailed policy or procedure of its own for the purpose of dealing with the number of judgements it was asked to make. But the Romans did have one or two basic approaches when it came to dealing with invitations to act as arbitrator. Occasionally the senate itself might hear the case. This is what happened when the Teian representatives of Abdera came to Rome (**169**); apparently Larisa and Pteleion (**78**), as well as Samos and Priene (**160**), also laid

63. We are told that the Achaian League controlled the foreign contacts of its members by refusing to allow them to send embassies to foreign states independently of the League (Polyb. 2.48.7). This does not prove, however, that the League itself had to be involved in any official capacity in arbitration among its members. In the case of Achaia's own disputes with Sparta in the second century, Achaia's efforts to settle the conflict itself were mostly unavailing.

64. Larsen, *CPh* 66 (1971) pp. 81f.

65. For discussions of Rome's involvement during this period with Greek arbitration, see Gruen, chap. 3; Marshall, *ANRW*.

66. See **104**, **112**, **114**, **123**, **134**.

their cases before the senate directly. When the senate itself heard the case, it is doubtful that an excessive amount of time was spent listening to the arguments of either side. Ratification of previous decisions, without a great deal of attention to detail, was probably not uncommon.[67]

More frequently the senate delegated the task of making a decision to someone on the spot. In the settlement of Greece after the Second Macedonian War, and of Asia after the war with Antiochos the Great, the Roman legates in Greece and Asia had the power of arbitrating the local disputes (**76**, **98**). Often the senate would send out legates specifically to investigate complaints that had been brought to its attention. In such cases the legates were frequently instructed to attempt mediation and conciliation.[68] Or the senate might pass on the task of arbitration to a body that perhaps understood the concept and procedure of Greek international arbitration better than the senate did itself: another Greek state. Miletos was asked to arbitrate the never-ending dispute between Sparta and Messenia (**159**), and Mylasa was invited to judge between Magnesia and Priene (**120**).[69] In cases such as these, or when representatives of Rome were sent to carry out an investigation, the senate could predetermine the general rule by which the actual arbitrators were to regulate their judgement. In cases of land dispute, the delegated judges were most frequently instructed to award the land to whichever state had possessed it when that state had entered into alliance or friendship with Rome. There is no doubt that for the losing state this directive must have appeared to be an alarmingly arbitrary basis for a ruling, especially given the lengthy history and sophisticated development of Greek arbitral theory and procedure. But from the Roman point of view there was some justification for it. It amounted to a declaration that Rome denied any responsibility for anything that had occurred before its appearance on the scene. Rome was not interested in legalistic or historical arguments that dated back to the return of the Herakleidai. Furthermore, this stance allowed Rome to support the position of its *amici*; if a friendly state was accused of unjustly holding territory at the time of its entry into Roman *amicitia*, the initial Roman decision ruled out any argumentation along these lines. But if a state was accused of seizing land after it and/or its opponent had become a friend of Rome, then a determination of this type demonstrated Roman refusal to sanction aggressive actions among states currently in the sphere of Roman friendship.

With respect to its involvement in Greek arbitration and mediation, Rome has been attacked as indifferent, biased, or downright dictatorial and defended as a patient and long-suffering arbitrator of petty and insignificant Greek

67. See **156** and **160**.

68. See **122**, **135**, **137**, **142**.

69. See also **131**, where the Roman praetor asked Korkyra to arbitrate between Ambrakia and Athamania. Note the provisos set down in the general Roman rulings after Apameia, where several cases of arbitration were passed on to neutral Greek states (**98**).

quarrels.[70] But Rome changed, the East changed, and the senatorial roll changed over the hundred years of Roman activity encompassed in this study. Examples can be found to support either view, and attempts to apply a single and dogmatic interpretation to the events of an entire century are misguided. On the whole, though, it seems fair to say that Rome failed to appreciate, or was simply not interested in appreciating, the nuances of Greek international arbitration.[71] Its own approach was a combination of opportunism, expediency, and insouciance. There was no requirement for the Romans to formulate a consistent and complex state policy for a procedure that concerned the Greeks more than them, particularly when it was possible to reach a compromise whereby the systems of Greek arbitration could continue to function under the Roman aegis. But a lack of Roman commitment in this field does not appear to have stopped the continuous stream of appeals to Rome that came out of the Greek states. And to be fair to the Romans, a not insignificant amount of their energy went into endless attempts to pacify and resolve disputes among the Greeks. Towards the end of the second century Rome expended great efforts to bring to an end the endemic conflict in east Crete.[72] In later years the practice of Romans arbitrating Greek disputes intensified: Atidius Geminus, the governor of Achaia, arbitrated between Sparta and Messene, and Avidius Nigrinus, the legate of Trajan, resolved the border disputes of Delphi. As time went on and the Roman presence in the East became permanent, there was less of a tendency for the Romans to delegate the task of arbitration to another Greek state.[73]

When it came to its own involvement as a disputant in cases of arbitration, Rome betrayed no inclination to allow its vital interests to be placed in the hands of one of the Greek states that offered from time to time to settle Rome's conflicts. In the early years of the Hellenistic age, if our sources may be relied upon, Greeks occasionally offered their services as arbitrators to the Romans. None of these offers met with anything but a cold reception (**8**, **27**, **35**). They were all connected to incidents that involved Rome's position and interests in the western Mediterranean: Italy and Carthage. Even if these offers did take place, it is not surprising that Rome would be disinclined to rely on an unfamiliar

70. See the discussion in Marshall, *ANRW*, pp. 628f.

71. The peculiarly Roman flavour imparted to some international relations comes out in **169**, where the Abderan (Teian) advocates carried out their task through the Roman patron-client system.

72. See **158**, **164**, **165**. All the "repeater" cases came to Rome in the end: Melitaia and Narthakion, Samos and Priene, Sparta and its neighbours Messene and Megalopolis.

73. But as late as the second century A.D. the Roman Poppaeus Sabinus asked the Thessalian League to arbitrate between Kierion and Metropolis (**25** Appendix). Atidius Geminus: Tac. *Ann.* 4.43; Avidius Nigrinus: see **88**; other Roman arbitrations in the later period: *IG* VII.2870, IX.1.61; *OGIS* 502; *CIL* III.586; *SEG* XX.709, XXIV.1109; and cf. A. Aichinger, *ZPE* 48 (1982) pp. 193–204; J. M. Fossey, *ANRW* II.7.1 (1979) pp. 568–69.

judicial procedure to protect its interests so close to home. When Rome became involved in affairs in the East it showed itself little more prepared to submit to Greek arbitration or mediation. The attempts made by various Greek states to mediate a settlement in the First Macedonian War appear to have been largely unsuccessful as far as Rome was concerned (**57**). Flamininus actually suggested arbitration to the Aitolians in 192; however, he appears to have made no distinction between neutral arbitration and the laying of the dispute before the Roman senate. When the Aitolians responded by suggesting that Antiochos might be more suitable as a mediator, the Romans naturally decided to go no farther with the idea (**84**).

It is clear that Rome was simply not accustomed to considering the process of arbitration as a significant tool of international diplomacy.[74] Rome's own policies in dealing with international affairs were not likely to encourage it to consider even such a limited surrender of its own sovereignty as arbitration demands. Nevertheless, so long as Rome considered that its own interests were secure, it did show that it was occasionally willing to listen to mediators. When Flamininus was preparing to make war on Boiotia after the Second Macedonian War, he accepted the mediation of Athenian and Achaian ambassadors (**75**). The Romans also allowed the Athenians and Rhodians to intercede on behalf of the Aitolians in 189, once the war was already won, and the Roman situation secure (**94**). Rome was indeed amenable to mediation in situations where it would not compromise the Roman position. In that, Rome was scarcely different from any other great power.

CONCLUSION

An examination of the historical and political aspects of Greek interstate arbitration also necessitates some general comments on the employment and efficacy of the procedure. Questions arise with respect to the theoretical basis of arbitration, as well as its practical application.

Interstate arbitration is largely grounded in philosophical principles that maintain a belief in the existence of some form of international law. The process of arbitration may appeal to such a belief to a greater or lesser extent. Some disputes might be settled strictly with a view to very specific points of law, and in a manner akin to that of the judgements of a regularly constituted domestic law court. Other settlements, while perhaps made on the basis of equity rather than law as such, can depend for their effectiveness on the commitment of both parties to the notion of the legal and binding authority of the judge. A process such as mediation, on the other hand, is a more flexible procedure and has less connection with the trappings of legalism.

74. See Matthaei, *CQ*, for a discussion of the Roman attitude towards arbitration.

But the assertion that arbitration between states is considered, at least in part, to have a legal basis and a grounding in international law begs the question, what *is* international law? What constitutes a law or series of laws binding on all nations? Some legal theoreticians maintain that such a thing as international law does indeed exist. Certainly the modern world has determined, or believes that it has determined, a rough general consensus of international *custom*, an agreement on the appropriate ways for nations to deal with each other. But there are exceptions to every rule of behaviour, and clashes of custom and belief between cultures. Furthermore, does custom, a general belief about rules of right behaviour, constitute law?

The Greeks too shared certain general beliefs about what constituted the proper way to conduct international relations in times of war and peace, even if their beliefs may not have been precisely those adhered to by much of the modern world. Thucydides says that when the Spartans thought about their role in the Archidamian War, they felt guilty because they had refused to go to arbitration, and they believed that the military setbacks they had suffered were consequently well deserved (7.18). The Greeks seem to have shared with the modern world a vague notion that some "international law" existed, a law that could be appealed to in cases of interstate disputes.

But the concept of the real existence of international law was as cloudy in the ancient as in the modern world. To reiterate, is law simply a generally agreed-upon custom, or is there more to it than that? Within the confines of a particular society, the body of laws appears to reflect the general consensus of the beliefs of that society, a consensus that is ultimately supported by the force which that society can bring to bear. When it comes to the belief in a law transcending particular societies, this concept of law suffers. For one thing, even among a community of nations with roughly similar values, differing beliefs and interpretations may arise. A consensus is not always easy, and sometimes impossible. For another, while it may seem cynical to assert that the ultimate sanction of law is force, there is an obvious truth to this statement. Within a particular community or society, force is available in the police and judicial systems. The move to the international scene, however, brings with it a change not only in scale but in kind. Military action, collective or otherwise, is the chief sanction available. In the ancient world, economic sanctions, while they might have a role to play from time to time, were not generally employed systematically. And as for the pressures that common religious beliefs might bring to bear, it is clear from Greek history that religion was ineffective as a means by which rules of international behaviour could be enforced. Thucydides is cited too much on the issue of arbitration and religious sanction. The Spartans may have felt guilty about the Archidamian War, and they may have felt that they were punished by heaven—but that was all after the fact.

The question of potential military action to enforce what may or might have seemed to many a dubious point of international "law" raises its own complex

of issues.[75] In the realm of arbitration specifically, one implication is that a potential arbitrator must have the ability to use force to support an arbitral decision (or have access to the resources of some other agency with such an ability); another is that an arbitrator must be *willing* to do so. And of course the ultimate implication is that law or legal decisions, while binding in theory, are potentially empty without force to support them. Without sanctions, parties to international disputes cannot be obliged to adhere to the decisions of arbitrators any more than to the desires of mediators.

It was noted above that another issue to consider when assessing the existence or efficacy of international law is the clash of cultural beliefs. On the surface, this would not have bedevilled the Greek world to the same extent that it does the international community today. But differing cultural beliefs affect the employment of arbitration in the Hellenistic period. In particular, Greek and Roman beliefs with respect to international law and relations were wont to clash.

A further question that often arises in a consideration of interstate arbitration is the so-called sincerity of its use. Disputes submitted to arbitration were and are generally of a legal rather than a political nature. But frequently the legal dispute is not the real heart of a quarrel, which may be rooted in graver political issues. Arbitration cannot therefore always resolve the real hostilities; and an invitation to it might be rejected out of hand on the grounds that while it cannot resolve these hostilities, it might still remove a perfectly good casus belli. The pretexts for the Peloponnesian War—the Epidamnos and Potidaia affairs, the Megarian decrees—were the kind of problems that should have been open to solution by arbitration; the underlying cause—Spartan fear—was not.

The Greeks have also been accused of insincerity in circumstances where there *was* an agreement to go to arbitration. Victor Berard in particular drew attention to the selfish motivations that lay behind many appeals to arbitration, and the tendency to exploit the procedure in order to gain one's own ends. His overall assessment of ancient arbitration amounts to an indictment of the system and of the Greeks themselves:

> Whenever they submitted a question to arbitration, their object was not to put an equitable conclusion to the dispute and renew peace and friendship with each other: but either they were worn out by war, and hoped for a brief respite in which to recover from their exhaustion, get together allies or mercenaries, and so with army reinforced to renew the war, or else, when some fresh power sprang up among the Greeks, they appealed to this not as an arbitrator but as an avenger.

75. Roux makes a telling comment with respect to the sanction of force in his discussion of the Amphiktyony and Sacred Wars (*L'Amphiktionie, Delphes et le temple d'Apollon* [Lyon,1979] p. 55): "C'est le drame éternel des institutions internationales créées pour établir la paix que d'être condamnées soit à voir leurs décisions demeurer lettre morte, soit à devoir en imposer le respect par l'emploi de la force, que leur idéal, leur raison d'être, serait justement d'éliminer."

> The unsuccessful party did, indeed, almost invariably accept the verdict in word, but never in spirit.[76]

It is interesting that Berard, in the midst of his cynicism about the Greek use of arbitration, nevertheless believed that the defeated party in an arbitration almost invariably accepted the verdict as final. In fact, the evidence scarcely supports this; but neither does it support Berard's view that states that *did* accept the verdict nevertheless retained some kind of spiritual resentment. They may well have done so, but how are we to know?

In any case, how relevant is this concern about sincerity? It must be recognized that self-assertion and even self-aggrandizement are at least part of the natural function and tendency of independent states. It is naïve to condemn either the states involved or the phenomenon of arbitration in general simply because many states chose (or choose) this method of achieving their aims. Some cases of dispute and arbitration from the ancient world were indeed "repeaters," such as the endless contentions of Samos and Priene (**26**, **74**, **99**, **160**). It is quarrels like this that Berard refers to in his charge that the Greeks merely awaited the appearance of a new power on the scene and then turned to that power to validate their own selfish aims. It is true that the "repeater" cases do indicate some sore points of insoluble friction; but this too is a permanent aspect of the international system, not a demonstration of the failings of arbitration.

The mere availability of arbitration as a procedure was far from enough. A sworn agreement to go to arbitration, either immediately or at some point in the future, was not always enough either. Furthermore, even if an arbitration did occur and was brought to a conclusion, we have no guarantee, in dealing with cases from antiquity, that the final decision was ultimately honoured by both parties. Here I differ from Tod, W. L. Westermann, and others in their estimation that, unless we hear otherwise, arbitrations were generally final and effective.[77] This is too sanguine a conclusion, particularly when we consider the various cases where we *know* that an arbitrator's final decision was not honoured. For instance, the arbitration between Sparta and Megalopolis that took place in the 160s was evidently invalidated by Sparta; but we would not necessarily be aware of this arbitral failure if it were not for the fortuitous discovery of an inscription (**135**, **137**). In at least half of the cases of arbitration from the Hellenistic period we simply do not know whether the parties adhered for any length of time to the arbitrator's judgement. Mere publication (inscription) of an award is not a sufficent criterion for assuming the ultimate success of an arbitration. Some of these uncertain cases probably were successful on a more or less permanent basis; but since a substantial proportion of the remaining certain cases of Hellenistic arbitration or attempts at arbitration were *definite*

76. Berard, p. 105; the translation of Berard's Latin text is that of Tod (p. 184).

77. See Tod, pp. 185f.; Westermann, *CJ* 2 (1906–7) pp. 208f.

failures, it stands to reason that among the uncertain group there were at least some failures.

On the other hand, some cases do give positive indications that they were successful over the long term. As for the "repeaters," disputes that went to arbitration again and again over the years, these cases make up some 10 percent or so of the total from the Hellenistic period. It can legitimately be asked whether the repeated appeal to arbitration should class these disputes among the failures of the procedure, as has often been the tendency, or among the successes. For one thing, the gap separating one appeal from the next was often one of several decades; in the fluid world of international politics, what constitutes a "permanent" settlement? For another, the appeals show that the parties themselves had a certain (perhaps less than idealistic) faith in the procedure, a faith demonstrated by their continual application to it. Exploitation and cynicism are undeniably part of the overall picture of international arbitration, just as they are of other aspects of international politics and diplomacy; but arbitration, at least some of the time, got the job done.

What assessment can we give then of Hellenistic arbitration as a whole? First of all, we can reiterate that it was part of a larger picture, a picture that encompassed the rest of the world of diplomacy and international relations. It was one of a group of procedures for third-party interventions, procedures that often shaded into one another. Like these other procedures of mediation, intervention, and good offices, arbitration was successful some of the time; that its success rate *may* have been less than 50 percent (which has not been proven by any means) did not obviate its usefulness. Judging from the widespread use of both mediation and arbitration in the Hellenistic age, efforts to employ them were considered perpetually worthy.

Second, arbitration was recognized to be at least a quasi-legal process, and the procedures employed were patterned on the models provided by Greek intrapolitical judicial customs. As discussed above, however, the law on which interstate arbitration rests is international law, a concept that can be more ideal than real. In comparison with international mediation, arbitration can indeed be said to be based on concepts of law. But when compared with the workings of an internal domestic law court, supported by community sanctions and specific laws, it is clear that international arbitration comes closer to the concepts of equity and justice. The Greeks never constituted a viable permanent international body, such as a joint arbitral tribunal. Such a body might have regularized notions of international law and made practical application of them in cases of disputes, thereby giving to those concepts universal recognition.

The Cases

1. The Delphic Amphiktyony judges a border dispute between Amphissa and Delphi (c. 338/7?)

A number of inscriptions from the temple of Apollo at Delphi. The inscriptions are from a later period (c. 125 B.C.) and contain various decrees regarding the treasure of Apollo and the delimitation of the sacred land. See **163** for a discussion of the dispute of 125 B.C. One of the inscriptions, cited in part here, refers to earlier judgements in the same territorial dispute (**163**, document II, columns B–D). See **163** for a full citation of editions and a more complete bibliography.

G. Colin, *BCH* 27 (1903) pp. 140–53; Tod 26; H. Pomtow, *Klio* 16 (1919) p. 139; Steinwenter, pp. 184, 186; Daux, *Delphes,* pp. 377–82; Lerat, p. 54; G. Roux, *L' Amphictionie, Delphes et le temple d'Apollon au IVe siècle* (Lyon, 1979) pp. 56, 234; Daverio Rocchi, pp. 132–42; Daverio Rocchi, *Mélanges.*

I: The inscription of 125 B.C., column B, lines 28–32

Ἀμφικτίονες ἐπέγνωσαν περὶ ὅρων Ἀπόλλωνος, ποίοις ὅροις ὁρίσασθαι δεῖ.[vvv] Ἀμφισσεῖς Ἀριστοκλέας, Δάμων πρεσβευτ[αὶ ἐλ]έγοσαν ὅτι δεῖ τὸ κρίμα ἑστηκὸς καὶ κύριον εἶναι τὸ τότε γεγονός, ὅτε Παυσανίας Θεσσαλὸς καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ ὅρους ἐποίησαν.[vv] Ἀντικυρεῖς, Ἀμ[βρ]ύσσιοι, Δελφοὶ ἐλέγοσαν τούτωι τῶι κρίματι ἑστηκὸς καὶ κύριον εἶναι δεῖν, ὅτε [ὅ]ρον ἱερομνήμονες πεποί[η]καν καὶ [κ]ε[κ]ρίκασιν ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Ὀ[ρνι]χίδα ἐν Δελφοῖς·[vvv] ὑπὲρ τούτων τοὺς λόγους ἐποήσατο Νικάτας Ἀλκίνου [Δ]ελφός.[vv] ἔκριναν·[vv] Δελφῶν ψᾶφοι δύο· ἱερομνημόνων κρί[ματι στ]ῆναι.[vv] Θεσσαλῶν ψῆφοι δύο· ἱερομνημόνων κρίματι στῆναι. κτλ.

II: The inscription of 125 B.C., column C, lines 7–10

[Ἔκριναν περὶ τῶν ὅρων τῆς χώ]ρας ἱερᾶς, ὥστε κρίμα κύριον εἶναι δ [ο]ἱ ἱερομνή-
[μονες ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Ὀρνιχίδα ἐν Δελφοῖς πεποιήκασιν οἱ ὁρίζοντες τὴν] ὁμοροῦσαν τῇι ἱερᾶι χώραι κατὰ πρόσωπον. ὅροι
[περιεγράφησαν . . . [10] . . . , διὰ ταύτην τὴν αἰτίαν ὅτι ἰδιῶταί τινες κατ]έχουσι τοὺς ἐξ συγκλήτου δόγματος
[τῶι θεῶι δεδομένους ἀγρούς, ἔστι δ' ὅπου ἐπεργάζονται . . . [14] . . . κα]ί τινες δῆμ[οι ὁμ]οροῦσαν ἑκάστου. κτλ.

C 8–9: [Οἱ ὁρίζοντες τὴν] ὁμοροῦσαν τῆι ἱερᾶι χώραι κατὰ πρόσωπον ὅροι | περιεγράφησαν κτλ.: Colin. || C 9: [οἱ αὐτοὶ περιεγράφησαν τῇδε διὰ ταύτην τὴν αἰτίαν κτλ.]: Pomtow, *SIG*^{3}. || C 10: ἐπεργάζονται τὴν ἱερὰν χώραν: Pomtow, *SIG*^{3}. τινες δῆμ[οι ὁμ]οροῦσαν· ἑκάστου ἄρχοντες κτλ.: Colin.

Our sources for this case are a set of inscriptions from Delphi dealing with a number of events from c. 125 B.C., including an arbitration and delimitation of the sacred territory of Delphi. The dispute was only one of a resurgent series between Delphi and its neighbours;[1] it involved Amphissa, Delphi's western Lokrian neighbour, on one side, and Delphi itself and the towns to the east (Antikyra and Ambryssos) on the other. The community of Myania may also have been a party to the dispute.[2] In the arbitration of 125 B.C. Amphissa appealed to a decision handed down by one Pausanias of Thessaly and his commission at some indeterminate previous date (**22**), while Delphi, Ambryssos, and Antikyra argued that a decision made by a hieromnemonic court in the year of the archonship of Ornichidas should be upheld. It is the latter Amphiktyonic judgement that constitutes this case.

Most scholars have followed Colin in identifying Ornichidas with the Delphic archon of c. 338/7 B.C.[3] A revision of boundaries in favour of Delphi (and to the detriment of Amphissa) would have resulted naturally from the situation after Chaironeia. The year before the battle, in a successful attempt to divert attention from a charge brought against Athens by the Amphissans, the Athenian Aischines had brought a countercharge against Amphissa, claiming that it was

1. See also **22**, **88**, **117**, **163**.

2. If Pomtow was correct in restoring Μυανεῖς at *SIG*^{3} 826E III (column C), line 16, then Myania could have been involved. There is no room, however, to restore Myania's name in the passage detailing the arguments of the opposing sides (column B, lines 29–30); only Amphissa is mentioned, on the one side, and Antikyra, Ambryssos, and Delphi on the other. Hence Myania may *not* have been involved in the disputes of c. 338/7 and c. 125. See **88** and **163**.

3. Colin *BCH* 27, pp. 142f. Daux (*Delphes*; *Chronologie Delphique* [Paris, 1943] p. 14) was not so certain that Ornichidas was archon in 338/7, but he did assign him to this general period. See also Roux, p. 234, who suggests tentatively 335/4 or 332/1.

illegally cultivating the sacred plain of Kirrha and charging dues for the use of the sacred harbour.[4] The result was the declaration of the "Fourth Sacred War" against Amphissa by the Amphiktyony, a war that gave Philip II his excuse for interference in Greece late in 339. The period after Chaironeia, then, would have been the ideal time to redraw the boundaries of the sacred land in a manner favourable to Delphi, a judgement reaffirmed two centuries later.

The land under discussion is the sacred land of Apollo (περὶ ὅρων Ἀπόλλωνος, B, line 28), the area to the south and west of Delphi, comprising the plain of Kirrha and the plateau of Desphina as far as the borders of Antikyra. While it has been argued that decisions regarding the boundaries of the sacred land were a matter of internal hieromnemonic jurisdiction,[5] the frequency with which Delphi and its neighbours appealed to both the Amphiktyony and outside powers, such as Rome, warrants the treatment of these cases along with those concerning public land (**117**).

2. The constitution of the League of Corinth (337)

I: Two fragments of a stele discovered on the Athenian acropolis, which apparently bore an inscription of the oath sworn by the Athenians upon entering the League of Corinth. Only the relevant portion is cited here.

A. Wilhelm, *Attische Urkunden*, pp. 1, 6f.; Kirchner, *IG* II^2 236; Dittenberger, *SIG*^{3} 260; U. Wilcken, *SPAW* 1929, p. 317; W. Schwahn, *Klio Beiheft* 21 (1930) pp. 2, 37; Tod, *GHI* 177; *Schmitt 403, I.

II: Polybios 9.33.11–12.

J. A. O. Larsen, *CPh* 20 (1925) pp. 313–29; id., *CPh* 21 (1926) 52–71; F. Schehl, *JÖAI* 27 (1932) pp. 115–45; H. O. Raue, "Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des korinthischen Bundes" (Diss., Marburg, 1935) pp. 5–6, 72–74; P. Treves, *JHS* 64 (1944) pp. 102–6; Roebuck, *CPh* pp. 73–92; I. Calabi, *PP* 3 (1948) pp. 258–62; id., *RFIC;* Robert, *REG* 1951, 25; id., *REG* 1953, 54; Calabi, *Ricerche,* pp. 139–44; Larsen, *Representative Government,* pp. 47–65; T. T. B. Ryder, *Koine Eirene* (Oxford, 1965) pp. 102f., 150f.; Walbank, *Comm,* vol. 2, pp. 172–73; N. G. L. Hammond/G. T. Griffith, *A History of Macedonia* II (Oxford, 1979) pp. 634f.; Harding, *TDGR* 99; S. J. Perlman, *Historia* 34 (1985) pp. 153–74.

4. Aischin. 3.106–29; Dem. 18.140–59.
5. Pomtow, *Klio* 18 (1923) p. 264; cf. Steinwenter, p. 184.

illegally cultivating the sacred plain of Kirrha and charging dues for the use of the sacred harbour.[4] The result was the declaration of the "Fourth Sacred War" against Amphissa by the Amphiktyony, a war that gave Philip II his excuse for interference in Greece late in 339. The period after Chaironeia, then, would have been the ideal time to redraw the boundaries of the sacred land in a manner favourable to Delphi, a judgement reaffirmed two centuries later.

The land under discussion is the sacred land of Apollo (περὶ ὅρων Ἀπόλλωνος, B, line 28), the area to the south and west of Delphi, comprising the plain of Kirrha and the plateau of Desphina as far as the borders of Antikyra. While it has been argued that decisions regarding the boundaries of the sacred land were a matter of internal hieromnemonic jurisdiction,[5] the frequency with which Delphi and its neighbours appealed to both the Amphiktyony and outside powers, such as Rome, warrants the treatment of these cases along with those concerning public land (**117**).

2. The constitution of the League of Corinth (337)

I: Two fragments of a stele discovered on the Athenian acropolis, which apparently bore an inscription of the oath sworn by the Athenians upon entering the League of Corinth. Only the relevant portion is cited here.

A. Wilhelm, *Attische Urkunden*, pp. 1, 6f.; Kirchner, *IG* II^2 236; Dittenberger, *SIG*^{3} 260; U. Wilcken, *SPAW* 1929, p. 317; W. Schwahn, *Klio Beiheft* 21 (1930) pp. 2, 37; Tod, *GHI* 177; *Schmitt 403, I.

II: Polybios 9.33.11–12.

J. A. O. Larsen, *CPh* 20 (1925) pp. 313–29; id., *CPh* 21 (1926) 52–71; F. Schehl, *JÖAI* 27 (1932) pp. 115–45; H. O. Raue, "Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des korinthischen Bundes" (Diss., Marburg, 1935) pp. 5–6, 72–74; P. Treves, *JHS* 64 (1944) pp. 102–6; Roebuck, *CPh* pp. 73–92; I. Calabi, *PP* 3 (1948) pp. 258–62; id., *RFIC;* Robert, *REG* 1951, 25; id., *REG* 1953, 54; Calabi, *Ricerche,* pp. 139–44; Larsen, *Representative Government,* pp. 47–65; T. T. B. Ryder, *Koine Eirene* (Oxford, 1965) pp. 102f., 150f.; Walbank, *Comm,* vol. 2, pp. 172–73; N. G. L. Hammond/G. T. Griffith, *A History of Macedonia* II (Oxford, 1979) pp. 634f.; Harding, *TDGR* 99; S. J. Perlman, *Historia* 34 (1985) pp. 153–74.

4. Aischin. 3.106–29; Dem. 18.140–59.
5. Pomtow, *Klio* 18 (1923) p. 264; cf. Steinwenter, p. 184.

I: The oath of the Athenians

[Ἂν δέ τις ποῆι τι] παράσπονδον πε-
[ρὶ τὰς cυνθήκας, βοηθήcω] καθότι ἂν παραγ-
[γέλλωcιν οἱ ἀδικούμενοι?] καὶ πολεμήcω τῶ-
[ι τὴν κοινὴν εἰρήνην? παρ]αβαίνοντι καθότι
[ἂν δοκῆι τῶι κοινῶι cυνεδ]ρίωι καὶ ὁ ἡγεμὼ-
[ν παραγγέλληι καὶ οὐκ ἐγκ]αταλείψω.

18–19: παραγ|[{αγ}γέλλωcιν οἱ cύνεδροι]: Schwahn. || 19: [οἱ ἀεὶ δεόμενοι] καὶ πολεμήcω: Wilhelm. || 19–20: τῶ|[ι τὰς κοινὰς cυνθήκας παρ]αβαίνοντι: Schwahn. τῶ|[ι τάcδε τὰς cυνθήκας παρ]αβαίνοντι: Schehl. τῶ|[ι τούcδε τοὺς ὅρκους παρ]αβαίνοντι: Raue. || 21: [ἂν ἧι cυντεταγμένον ἐμαυ]τῶι: Wilhelm.

II: Polybios 9.33.11–12

... ἐπὶ τῷ κοινῇ cυμφέροντι διὰ λόγου τὴν ἐξαγωγὴν ἀμφοτέρους ἠνάγκαcε ποιήcαcθαι περὶ τῶν ἀμφιcβητουμένων, οὐχ αὑτὸν ἀποδείξας κριτὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀντιλεγομένων, ἀλλὰ κοινὸν ἐκ πάντων τῶν Ἑλλήνων καθίcας κριτήριον.

None of the primary sources available offers us a complete picture of the constitution of the League of Corinth, and much controversy remains about the exact details of its organization.[1] Nevertheless, it may be conjectured that the League of Corinth included provision for arbitration between its member states. If such a provision did not consist of a formal clause included at the inception of the League, then it probably arose as the natural outcome of the constitution of such an organization.[2] Once the League was constituted, it would have become the obvious arbitrating body within Greece. Although the primary evidence for the League does not explicitly state anywhere that it was to arbitrate disputes between member states, the implication is strong that some such activity on its part was to take place.

Previous common peace treaties in the fourth century had begun to include a guarantee clause in case of aggression.[3] In these instances, those states that had taken oaths to uphold the common peace were obliged to take up arms against any aggressor who broke the peace. This type of guarantee of the common peace does not appear to have provided for any judicial inquiry into the claims

1. Primary sources on the League of Corinth: [Dem.] 17; *IG* II^2 236; *IG* IV^2 1.68 (see **14**). See Ryder, pp. 150–51, 159; Larsen, *CPh* 20, p. 318; id., *Representative Government,* p. 54; Hammond/Griffith, p. 634.

2. Cf. Hammond/Griffith, p. 636: "It is indisputable that the primary function of the *sunedrion,* to preserve the *koine eirene,* itself conferred on it something of the character of a court of justice from the very start, since any and every inter-state dispute that ever came to its notice inevitably threw up its plaintiff and its defendant, addressing the *sunedroi* like dicasts."

3. See Ryder, pp. 128, 132, 141.

made by the states involved in the potential hostilities. As time went on, however, some innovations were made in this respect. It appears that the common peace of 362/1 featured provision for arbitration,[4] and the same seems to hold true for the peace of 338/7. A guarantee clause was part of Philip's common peace, just as with previous common peaces. The states partaking in the treaty were to come jointly to the aid of any victim of aggression.[5] But provision was also made for a legal or judicial decision to preface (and perhaps render unnecessary) any military action. Such military action was only to be taken in accordance with a decision of the *synedrion* of the League.[6] There would therefore have been ample opportunity for arbitration to be carried out by the League council. A judicial decision could be made that would give a ruling on the legal aspects of the dispute.

The hegemon of the League was also to have a say in any action taken against transgressors (lines 21–22). Given the nature of the relationship between the League of Corinth states and the Macedonian hegemon, we can hardly expect that the king would have agreed to delegate the absolute power of final decision on transgressors of the peace to the *synedrion*. Fellow Greek sympathies and anti-Macedonian feelings might combine to create a situation unfavourable to Macedon. The hegemon, or his representative in Greece, was therefore endowed with the power of making war on transgressors of the common peace, and exercised that power when such transgressions threatened his hegemony. Alexander took military action against the Thebans in 335, and Antipater acted as the agent of the king in making war on Sparta during Agis's "revolt" of 331. In both these instances the legal or judicial power of the *synedrion* appears to have functioned only after the fact, when it was consulted about a suitable judgement on the defeated transgressors. Therefore, although it was consulted (theoretically as the supreme authority) on these matters, the *synedrion* could scarcely be said to have arbitrated between Macedon and the rebellious Greek states. It was consulted because it was expected to make a judgement that would be in keeping with the hegemon's wishes.

Nevertheless, there is no evidence that Philip or his successor interfered in a "hegemonial" capacity in all settlements of minor problems among the Greek states. The Macedonian concern was with disputes or transgressions of the peace that might be a potential threat to their control and exploitation of Greek military power. Minor border squabbles would not concern the kings, just as

4. See Piccirilli 48.

5. Cf. [Dem.] 17 passim.

6. Lines 20–21: καθότι| [ἂν δοκῇι τῶι κοινῶι συνεδ]ρίωι (this line is largely restored, and Wilhelm does offer an alternate reading: καθότι| [ἂν ἦι συντεταγμένον ἐμαυ]τῶι). In support of the notion that the *synedrion* played an important role in questions of transgression of the treaty, the document recording the constitution of the later Hellenic League of 302 may be cited (**14**, III, lines 83–87).

they generally did not concern the historians. Hence our one example in which the Greek *synedrion does* appear to have exercised its arbitral function with no pressure (or perceived pressure) from Philip or Alexander involves a pair of small states and is known only through the fortuitous discovery of an inscription. This is the dispute between Melos and Kimolos over the ownership of three small islands, a dispute that was apparently submitted to the *synedrion* for settlement and referred by it to Argos (**3**). We should not expect to find much notice in the literary sources of the *synedrion*'s independent actions as a neutral arbitrator. A dispute important enough to have gained attention in the confused literary records of this period would also have attracted the attention of the Macedonian hegemon. In such a case, the dispute might be dealt with in similar fashion to Philip's "arbitration" between Sparta and its neighbours, and the strict neutrality of the procedure would be compromised.[7]

Although the territorial arrangements made by Philip in 338 were for the most part far from disinterested settlements and were certainly meant to be advantageous to him through benefitting his allies, they were later considered to have been arbitrations. The reason for this is that these settlements were in all probability ratified in 337 by the *synedrion* of the League of Corinth and given a (perhaps specious) legal standing.[8] Polybios tells us that in the year 210 the orator Lykiskos could argue that Philip had established a neutral judicial tribunal of states that dealt with the land disputes between Sparta and its neighbours. Given the pro-Macedonian stance of Lykiskos, the statement may be suspect. Philip II certainly did settle Sparta's borders to suit himself. Nevertheless, the claim makes no sense without some basis in fact, and the best explanation seems to be that an arbitral tribunal was in fact established and did ratify Philip's settlements.[9]

Philip may have set up a separate tribunal of Greek states to ratify his decisions; on the other hand, such a ratification may have been carried out by the *synedrion* of the League of Corinth sitting as a tribunal. In any case, it would be hard to define these actions as neutral arbitration. Sparta would indeed have been justified in challenging both the de facto decision of Philip and the de iure decision of the Greeks. Nevertheless, the "arbitral" activity perhaps carried out at this time by the *synedrion* would have set a precedent.

7. See Piccirilli 60, 61.

8. See Roebuck, *CPh*, pp. 74, 88–89; Treves, p. 105.

9. For other evidence that Philip's de facto settlements were given a de iure "arbitral" basis through the League, cf. the following testimonia, which may refer to these settlements of Philip as judicial decisions:

a. *SIG*^{3} 665, the document that records a later arbitration between Sparta and Megalopolis, refers to κρίσεις made by the Greek allies, perhaps at this time (**137**, lines 19–20).

b. Livy 38.34. 8 refers to an old decree of the "Achaians" (*decreto vetere Achaeorum*, probably a mistake for the Hellenes), whereby the Spartans lost the Belbinatis in the time of Philip II.

At the very least, it would now be recognized that there was a body available that was empowered to arbitrate disputes. This was probably a precedent to which the states of Melos and Kimolos were able to refer (3).[10] Guarantees against aggression of the kind typical in a common peace treaty were not in themselves guarantees of arbitration. But with the *synedrion* now available as a permanent institution, a body now existed that could take a judicial approach to the settlement of disputes, not just a military one.

3. Argos arbitrates between Kimolos and Melos at the request of the League of Corinth (337 or later)

A stele bearing a decree of Kimolos, discovered in Smyrna, where it had been transported and built into a wall. H (max.): c. 0.45 m; w: 0.315 m.

P. LeBas, *RA* 11 (1854–55) pp. 577f.; F. Schneidewin, *Philologus* 9 (1854) pp. 588–91, no. 37; LeBas/Waddington 1; Schneidewin, Μουσεῖον καὶ βιβλιοθήκη 1 (1873–75) p. 101, no. 103; Cauer[2] 58; Prellwitz, *SGDI* 3277; Berard 30; Dittenberger, *SIG*[2] 428; Michel 14; *Hiller von Gaertringen, *IG* XII.3.1259; Hicks/Hill 150; Phillipson, p. 141 n. 3; Dittenberger/Hiller von Gaertringen, *SIG*[3] 261; Schwyzer 85; Nachmanson, *HGI* 50; W. Vollgraff, *Mnemosyne* 43 (1915) pp. 383–84; Tod, *GHI* 179; Calabi, *Ricerche,* p. 116; Buck 86; G. Pföhl, *Griechische Inschriften* (Munich, 1966) 105; Guarducci, *Epigrafia greca,* pp. 552–53, no. 172; J. B. Hainsworth, *Tituli ad dialectos Graecas illustrandas selecti* II (Leiden, 1972) 37; M. Guarducci, *L'epigrafia greca* (Rome, 1987) pp. 101–2.

A. Kirchhoff, *Studien zur Geschichte der griechischen Alphabets*[4] (Amsterdam, 1887; reprint, 1970) pp. 100–101; Sonne 54; F. Bechtel, *Bezzenberger's Beiträge* 20 (1894) p. 241; M. Fränkel, *SPAW* 1898, pp. 637f.; A. Wilhelm, *GGA* 1898, p. 205; id., *GGA* 1900, p. 14; Raeder 29; Tod 47; C. D. Buck, *CPh* 8 (1913) p. 151; W. Vollgraff, *Mnemosyne* 44 (1916) pp. 61–64; F. Hiller von Gaertringen, *SPAW* 1919, p. 660; Steinwenter, p. 181; W. Vollgraff, *Mnemosyne* 58 (1930) pp. 34f.; Tod, *Sidelights,* p. 47; Robert, *REG* 1951, 25; Calabi, *Ricerche,* pp. 116–18; Larsen, *Representative Government,* p. 64; *SEG* XII.367; Ténékidès, pp. 545–46; P. Charneux, *BCH* 82 (1958) pp. 4–5; Robert, *REG* 1959, 295; id., *REG* 1960, 303; id., *REG* 1967, 260; C. Renfrew/M. Wagstaff, *An Island Polity* (Cambridge, 1982) p. 50.

10. See Hammond/Griffith, p. 637, for the suggestion that the case of Melos and Kimolos is potential, though far from certain, proof of an arbitration clause in the constitution of the League of Corinth. The fact that the *synedrion* was involved in this affair would lead us to believe that the *synedrion* was always the arbitral body and that no separate tribunal was ever constituted. Calabi (*RFIC,* pp. 63f.) thinks that Philip set up a separate tribunal before the states met at Corinth.

At the very least, it would now be recognized that there was a body available that was empowered to arbitrate disputes. This was probably a precedent to which the states of Melos and Kimolos were able to refer (3).[10] Guarantees against aggression of the kind typical in a common peace treaty were not in themselves guarantees of arbitration. But with the *synedrion* now available as a permanent institution, a body now existed that could take a judicial approach to the settlement of disputes, not just a military one.

3. Argos arbitrates between Kimolos and Melos at the request of the League of Corinth (337 or later)

A stele bearing a decree of Kimolos, discovered in Smyrna, where it had been transported and built into a wall. H (max.): c. 0.45 m; w: 0.315 m.

P. LeBas, *RA* 11 (1854–55) pp. 577f.; F. Schneidewin, *Philologus* 9 (1854) pp. 588–91, no. 37; LeBas/Waddington 1; Schneidewin, Μουσεῖον καὶ βιβλιοθήκη 1 (1873–75) p. 101, no. 103; Cauer[2] 58; Prellwitz, *SGDI* 3277; Berard 30; Dittenberger, *SIG*[2] 428; Michel 14; *Hiller von Gaertringen, *IG* XII.3.1259; Hicks/Hill 150; Phillipson, p. 141 n. 3; Dittenberger/Hiller von Gaertringen, *SIG*[3] 261; Schwyzer 85; Nachmanson, *HGI* 50; W. Vollgraff, *Mnemosyne* 43 (1915) pp. 383–84; Tod, *GHI* 179; Calabi, *Ricerche,* p. 116; Buck 86; G. Pföhl, *Griechische Inschriften* (Munich, 1966) 105; Guarducci, *Epigrafia greca,* pp. 552–53, no. 172; J. B. Hainsworth, *Tituli ad dialectos Graecas illustrandas selecti* II (Leiden, 1972) 37; M. Guarducci, *L'epigrafia greca* (Rome, 1987) pp. 101–2.

A. Kirchhoff, *Studien zur Geschichte der griechischen Alphabets*[4] (Amsterdam, 1887; reprint, 1970) pp. 100–101; Sonne 54; F. Bechtel, *Bezzenberger's Beiträge* 20 (1894) p. 241; M. Fränkel, *SPAW* 1898, pp. 637f.; A. Wilhelm, *GGA* 1898, p. 205; id., *GGA* 1900, p. 14; Raeder 29; Tod 47; C. D. Buck, *CPh* 8 (1913) p. 151; W. Vollgraff, *Mnemosyne* 44 (1916) pp. 61–64; F. Hiller von Gaertringen, *SPAW* 1919, p. 660; Steinwenter, p. 181; W. Vollgraff, *Mnemosyne* 58 (1930) pp. 34f.; Tod, *Sidelights,* p. 47; Robert, *REG* 1951, 25; Calabi, *Ricerche,* pp. 116–18; Larsen, *Representative Government,* p. 64; *SEG* XII.367; Ténékidès, pp. 545–46; P. Charneux, *BCH* 82 (1958) pp. 4–5; Robert, *REG* 1959, 295; id., *REG* 1960, 303; id., *REG* 1967, 260; C. Renfrew/M. Wagstaff, *An Island Polity* (Cambridge, 1982) p. 50.

10. See Hammond/Griffith, p. 637, for the suggestion that the case of Melos and Kimolos is potential, though far from certain, proof of an arbitration clause in the constitution of the League of Corinth. The fact that the *synedrion* was involved in this affair would lead us to believe that the *synedrion* was always the arbitral body and that no separate tribunal was ever constituted. Calabi (*RFIC,* pp. 63f.) thinks that Philip set up a separate tribunal before the states met at Corinth.

Θεός.
ἔκρινε ὁ δᾶμος ὁ τῶν
Ἀργείων κατὰ τὸ δόκη-
μα τοῦ cυνεδρίου τῶν
Ἑλλάνων, ὁμολογη-
cάντων Μαλίων καὶ
Κιμωλίων ἐμμενέν,
ἄι κα δικάccαιεν τοὶ
Ἀργεῖοι περὶ τᾶν
[ν]άcων, Κιμωλίων
ἦμεν Πολύαιγαν Ἑτήι-
ρειαν Λίβειαν. ἐδί-
καccαν νικᾶν Κιμωλ[ί]-
[ο]υc. ἀρήτευε Λέων·
[β]ωλ[ᾶ]c ceυτέρας· Ποcιδά-
ον γρο[φ]εὺc βωλᾶc· Πέριλ-
λος πεδιόν.

8: ἄι κα: LeBas, Prellwitz. ἄι καδ(δ)ικάccειεν: Cauer. αἴ κα: Schneidewin, Mouceῖον. || 10: ν́άcων: Pföhl. || 14: Λέων: LeBas. Λεώνηξ: Mouceῖον. || 15: [β]ωλᾶc: Pföhl. || 16: γροφεὺc: Pföhl. || 15–17: [β]ωλ[ᾶ]c{c}Εὐτέρας Ποcίδαον· γρο[φ]εὺc βωλᾶc Πέριλλος Πεδίον: Vollgraff, followed by Charneux, Robert. || 17: Πεδίον: Schwyzer, Tod, Buck, Guarducci, Hainsworth. Hiller von Gaertringen explains πεδιόν as the present participle of πέδειμι (= μέτειμι). Vollgraff believed that it, like Ποcίδαον, indicated the name of a *kome* (i.e., a "demotic").

This stone, which bears an inscription in the Argive dialect concerning an arbitration between two islands in the Cyclades, was found at Smyrna in Asia Minor. This copy of the judgement was doubtless originally from Kimolos, the state in whose favour the decision was made, and was carried from there to Smyrna, perhaps as building material.[1] The inscription tells of the adjudication of Argos, at the behest of the "*synedrion* of the Hellenes," in a dispute between the islands of Melos and Kimolos over the possession of three small islands nearby.[2] The vagueness of the term τοῦ cυνεδρίου τῶν Ἑλλάνων has in the past led to some confusion in dating this arbitration. LeBas, for instance, identified the *synedrion* with an Argive amphiktyony, supposedly a later form of the Hellenic League, which was first formed against Persia.[3] He dated the inscription to 417 B.C., reasoning that after 416 no appeal could have been made from Melos to a Dorian state. Kirchhoff identified the *synedrion* with the Delphic Amphiktyony and dated the event to the period after the Melian restoration under Lysander.[4]

1. LeBas, *RA* 11, pp. 578f.; LeBas/Waddington, pp. 1f.

2. See LeBas, *RA* 11, pp. 580f., and LeBas/Waddington, p. 2, for a discussion of the identification and location of these islands (Polyaiga, Heteireia, Libeia).

3. LeBas, *RA* 11, pp. 583, 586; LeBas/Waddington, p. 7.

4. Kirchhoff, p. 101; *SGDI* 3277.

Sonne was one of the first to see in the *synedrion* the League of Corinth, and to date the arbitration to 337 B.C.[5] It could then be one among many cases that were settled after the Macedonian victory at Chaironeia and the organization of the Greek alliance.

Although it is now generally accepted that the *synedrion* of this decree refers to the League of Corinth, there is little else we can learn from the inscription regarding the mechanisms for arbitration within the League itself. Certainly we may conclude that in this case, as was a common practice among the leagues in general, the task of arbitration was delegated to a neutral city that was also a member of the League.[6] The decision may have been made by the entire Argive assembly acting as arbitrator (ἔκρινε ὁ δᾶμος).[7] Melos and Kimolos may have approached the League voluntarily; at any rate they bound themselves to act by its decision or that of its delegate (lines 4–6). This may imply that, whatever the circumstances of the settlements between Sparta and its neighbours, settlements that were perhaps imposed by Philip and then ratified by the League of Corinth, here at least both disputants and arbitrators were acting with a certain degree of autonomy.[8]

4. The Ionian League judges a question of religious administration (335 or earlier)

An inscription found at the Panionion on the promontory of Mykale.

G. Wheler, *A Journey into Greece* (London, 1682) p. 268; Böckh, *CIG* 2909; O. Hoffmann, *Die griechischen Dialekte* (Göttingen, 1891–) vol. 3, pp. 55f., no. 115; Bechtel, *SGDI* 5588; Michel 484; *Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene* 139.

Sonne, p. 29; U. von Wilamowitz, *SPAW* 25 (1906) p. 50; Raeder 32; Lécrivain, p. 8; de Taube, p. 21; P. Hommel, in *Panionion und Melie,* ed. G. Kleiner, P. Hommel, and W. Müller-Wiener (Berlin, 1967) pp. 45–63; Robert, *REG* 1968, 468; Billows, p. 217.

Ἐπὶ πρυτάνεως Ἀμύντορος ἔδο-
ξεν Ἰώνων τῇ βουλῇ· τῶν Λεβεδί-

5. See Sonne 54. See also Berard, p. 41; Hiller von Gaertringen, *IG*; Hicks/Hill; Nachmanson, p. 43; *SIG*^{3}, p. 469; Schwyzer, p. 43; Tod, *GHI*.

6. See **38**, **41**, 55, **56**. It should be kept in mind that the League of Corinth was of course a looser organization than these regional leagues and should perhaps not be referred to as a "league" at all.

7. Raeder, p. 64. Tod, however, (p. 100) considers the term δᾶμος merely to refer to the supreme authority of the court; he does not believe that the whole people of Argos would have sat in judgement.

8. See **2** for a discussion of the arbitral powers of the League of Corinth and Philip's settlements in 338/7.

Sonne was one of the first to see in the *synedrion* the League of Corinth, and to date the arbitration to 337 B.C.[5] It could then be one among many cases that were settled after the Macedonian victory at Chaironeia and the organization of the Greek alliance.

Although it is now generally accepted that the *synedrion* of this decree refers to the League of Corinth, there is little else we can learn from the inscription regarding the mechanisms for arbitration within the League itself. Certainly we may conclude that in this case, as was a common practice among the leagues in general, the task of arbitration was delegated to a neutral city that was also a member of the League.[6] The decision may have been made by the entire Argive assembly acting as arbitrator (ἔκρινε ὁ δᾶμος).[7] Melos and Kimolos may have approached the League voluntarily; at any rate they bound themselves to act by its decision or that of its delegate (lines 4–6). This may imply that, whatever the circumstances of the settlements between Sparta and its neighbours, settlements that were perhaps imposed by Philip and then ratified by the League of Corinth, here at least both disputants and arbitrators were acting with a certain degree of autonomy.[8]

4. The Ionian League judges a question of religious administration (335 or earlier)

An inscription found at the Panionion on the promontory of Mykale.

G. Wheler, *A Journey into Greece* (London, 1682) p. 268; Böckh, *CIG* 2909; O. Hoffmann, *Die griechischen Dialekte* (Göttingen, 1891–) vol. 3, pp. 55f., no. 115; Bechtel, *SGDI* 5588; Michel 484; *Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene* 139.

Sonne, p. 29; U. von Wilamowitz, *SPAW* 25 (1906) p. 50; Raeder 32; Lécrivain, p. 8; de Taube, p. 21; P. Hommel, in *Panionion und Melie,* ed. G. Kleiner, P. Hommel, and W. Müller-Wiener (Berlin, 1967) pp. 45–63; Robert, *REG* 1968, 468; Billows, p. 217.

Ἐπὶ πρυτάνεως Ἀμύντορος ἔδο-
ξεν Ἰώνων τῇ βουλῇ· τῶν Λεβεδί-

5. See Sonne 54. See also Berard, p. 41; Hiller von Gaertringen, *IG*; Hicks/Hill; Nachmanson, p. 43; *SIG*^{3}, p. 469; Schwyzer, p. 43; Tod, *GHI*.

6. See **38**, **41**, 55, **56**. It should be kept in mind that the League of Corinth was of course a looser organization than these regional leagues and should perhaps not be referred to as a "league" at all.

7. Raeder, p. 64. Tod, however, (p. 100) considers the term δᾶμος merely to refer to the supreme authority of the court; he does not believe that the whole people of Argos would have sat in judgement.

8. See **2** for a discussion of the arbitral powers of the League of Corinth and Philip's settlements in 338/7.

ων ἀξιόντων ἀναγράπψαι εἰς στή-
λην τέλεσι τοῖς ἑ⟨ω⟩υτῶν καὶ
στῆσαι εἰς Ιαν⟨ι⟩ώνιον περὶ
τῆς δίκης τῆς γενομένης περὶ
τῆς ἱερατείης τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ
⟨Β⟩ουλήιου καὶ τῆς Ἥ⟨ρ⟩η⟨ς⟩· δοῦ⟨ν⟩αι
αὐτοῖς κατάπερ [καὶ] ⟨α⟩ὐτοὶ ἀξιοῦς[ι].
ἐπὶ Χίου πρυτανε⟨ύο⟩ντος Λεβε-
δίοις κατα - - - - - - - - - -

4: ΕΟΥΤΩΝ. || 5: ΠΑΝΩΝΙΟΝ. || 8: ΜΟΥΛΗΙΟΥΚΑΙΤΗΣΗΚΗΕΔΟΥ-ΜΑΙ. || 9: ΛΟΤΟΙ. || 10: ΠΡΥΤΑΝΕΩΝΤΟΣ.

This document is an inscription put up at the Panionion, the cult centre of the Ionian League, by the Lebedians. It records their request, addressed to the council of the League, to be allowed to erect a stele commemorating the decision made in a dispute between Lebedos and another of the Ionian states.[1] This permission was given, and the Lebedians prefixed this decree to the actual record of the arbitration. Hiller von Gaertringen pointed out that the inscription should predate 334, the year that Priene began to date its decrees by the office of the *stephanephoros*.[2] The final decision of the arbitrators is now lost, but the inscription as it stands summarizes the subject of the dispute. Lebedos and another Ionian city, possibly Priene, had laid conflicting claims to the direction of a priestly college.[3] The cult concerned was that of Zeus Boulaios and Hera, apparently a federal cult of the Ionian League; the phrasing of the inscription and the dating formula employed suggest that the council of the Ionian League acted as arbitrator in the dispute. Although the inscription does not explicitly state that the Lebedians were the winners, it seems likely that they were.

Federal leagues frequently arbitrated between member states or delegated a third state to do so.[4] The federation of the Ionian states, however, was not quite of the same calibre as the Hellenistic Achaian or Aitolian League. It would have been natural for the Ionian council to arbitrate an issue concerning the administration of a federal cult; but it is doubtful that it would exercise the same authority over all interstate disputes that the mainland leagues might have had. Furthermore, the course of events and the pattern of arbitrations in Asia Minor in the early Hellenistic age suggest that the preponderant role in this field was

1. Cf. the request of the Messenians to the authorities at Elis (**159**).

2. *IPriene*, p. 13 and no. 139; see also Hommel, p. 51. Bechtel had already dated the inscription to the latter part of the fourth century on dialectal grounds.

3. For a comparable case involving religious jurisdiction, cf. **16**. On the identification of Priene here, see Böckh's comments on Priene's claims to the cult of Poseidon at Mykale.

4. See **36**, **38**, **43**, **55**, **56**, **116**.

played by the kings.[5] This would suggest, even without Hiller von Gaertringen's observations on the dating of this inscription, that the dispute over the priesthood of Zeus Boulaios and Hera predates Alexander's expedition to Asia.

5. Officials of Alexander III arbitrate between Philippi and neighbouring Thracian tribes (c. 335 or 330)

An inscription discovered in a Byzantine basilica at Philippi in 1936 (unpublished until 1984). The inscription is in two columns (A and B). H: just over 0.5 m.

C. Vatin, Πρακτικὰ τοῦ Η' Διεθνοῦς Συνεδρίου Ἑλληνικῆς καὶ Λατινικῆς Ἐπιγραφικῆς I (Athens, 1984) pp. 259–70; *L. Missitzis, *Ancient World* 12 (1985) pp. 3–14.

M. G. Hatzopoulos, *REG* 100 (1987) no. 714, pp. 436–39; Hammond/Walbank, *Macedonia,* vol. 3, p. 475; N. G. L. Hammond, *CQ* 38 (1988) pp. 382–91; E. Badian, *ZPE* 79 (1989) pp. 59–70; N. G. L. Hammond, *ZPE* 82 (1990) pp. 167–75; E. Badian, *ZPE* 95 (1993) pp. 131–39.

A:

- -ρcιδ . .
[καὶ - - - - - - - - - - - Φιλιππ]ήc[ιοι π]ρεcβεύcαν-
[τες πρὸc βαcιλέα Ἀλέ]ξαν[δ]ρον· καὶ Ἀλέξανδροc
[τάδε διατέταχε]ν. τὴν ἀργὸν ἐργάζεcθαι Φ[ιλί]π-
[πουc . . . ἐcτ]ὶν χώρα καὶ προcτελοῦc[ι . . .]
[- - - - - - τ]ὴν ἀργὸν· ὁρίcαι δὲ τὴν - - - - - - -
- - - - - - -c Φιλώταν καὶ Λεονν[άτον - - - - - -]
[- - - - - ἐπειcβ]εβήκαcιν τῆc χώ[ρας - - - - - -]
[- - - - Φιλίπ]ποιc ἔδωκεν Φίλ[ιππος - - - - - -]
- - - - - - - - - ἐπιcκέψα[cθαι - - - - - - - - - -]
- - - - - - - - - -αcιν τοῦ - - - - - - - - - - - -
[- - - - - - - - ἐ]πειcβεβήκ[αcιν - - - - - - - - -]
- - - - - - - - - ἐξελεῖν - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - πλέθρα διcχ[ίλια - - - - - - - -]
- - - - - - - - - - Δάτου χώρα- - - - - - - - - - -

vacat

5. See **6**, **7**, **13**, **25**, **26**. Antigonos I synoikised the two states of Lebedos and Teos towards the end of the fourth century (**13**), a process that required and envisioned a certain amount of arbitration. At that time Lebedos probably lost some of its rights in the federal cult, since Antigonos's plans for the synoikism called for the Lebedians to form part of the Teian religious delegation to the Panionion, rather than maintaining their own independent representation (Welles, *RC* 3, sec. 1).

played by the kings.[5] This would suggest, even without Hiller von Gaertringen's observations on the dating of this inscription, that the dispute over the priesthood of Zeus Boulaios and Hera predates Alexander's expedition to Asia.

5. Officials of Alexander III arbitrate between Philippi and neighbouring Thracian tribes (c. 335 or 330)

An inscription discovered in a Byzantine basilica at Philippi in 1936 (unpublished until 1984). The inscription is in two columns (A and B). H: just over 0.5 m.

C. Vatin, Πρακτικὰ τοῦ Η' Διεθνοῦς Συνεδρίου Ἑλληνικῆς καὶ Λατινικῆς Ἐπιγραφικῆς I (Athens, 1984) pp. 259–70; *L. Missitzis, *Ancient World* 12 (1985) pp. 3–14.

M. G. Hatzopoulos, *REG* 100 (1987) no. 714, pp. 436–39; Hammond/Walbank, *Macedonia,* vol. 3, p. 475; N. G. L. Hammond, *CQ* 38 (1988) pp. 382–91; E. Badian, *ZPE* 79 (1989) pp. 59–70; N. G. L. Hammond, *ZPE* 82 (1990) pp. 167–75; E. Badian, *ZPE* 95 (1993) pp. 131–39.

A:

- -ρcιδ . .
[καὶ - - - - - - - - - - - Φιλιππ]ήc[ιοι π]ρεcβεύcαν-
[τες πρὸc βαcιλέα Ἀλέ]ξαν[δ]ρον· καὶ Ἀλέξανδροc
[τάδε διατέταχε]ν. τὴν ἀργὸν ἐργάζεcθαι Φ[ιλί]π-
[πουc . . . ἐcτ]ὶν χώρα καὶ προcτελοῦc[ι . . .]
[- - - - - - τ]ὴν ἀργὸν· ὁρίcαι δὲ τὴν - - - - - - -
- - - - - - -c Φιλώταν καὶ Λεονν[άτον - - - - - -]
[- - - - - ἐπειcβ]εβήκαcιν τῆc χώ[ρας - - - - - -]
[- - - - Φιλίπ]ποιc ἔδωκεν Φίλ[ιππος - - - - - -]
- - - - - - - - - ἐπιcκέψα[cθαι - - - - - - - - - -]
- - - - - - - - - -αcιν τοῦ - - - - - - - - - - - -
[- - - - - - - - ἐ]πειcβεβήκ[αcιν - - - - - - - - -]
- - - - - - - - - ἐξελεῖν - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - πλέθρα διcχ[ίλια - - - - - - - -]
- - - - - - - - - - Δάτου χώρα- - - - - - - - - - -

vacat

5. See **6**, **7**, **13**, **25**, **26**. Antigonos I synoikised the two states of Lebedos and Teos towards the end of the fourth century (**13**), a process that required and envisioned a certain amount of arbitration. At that time Lebedos probably lost some of its rights in the federal cult, since Antigonos's plans for the synoikism called for the Lebedians to form part of the Teian religious delegation to the Panionion, rather than maintaining their own independent representation (Welles, *RC* 3, sec. 1).

B:

[- - - - - - πρ]οcλαβε[ῖν] ἀπὸ - - - - - - - - -
μ[- - - - - cτ]αδίουc· τ[ῶ]ν μὲν α- - - - - - -
ν- - - - - - - - - - -c· ὅca δὲ τοῖc Θραιξὶν [ὑπὸ]
[Φιλίππου δέδο]ται, κα[ρ]πίζεcθαι τοὺc Θρ[ᾶι]-
[κας καθάπερ καὶ Ἀλέξαν]δροc περὶ αὐτῶν δια-
[τέταχεν· Φιλίππου]c δὲ ἔχειν τὴν χώραν τὴν
[- - - - - - - - -, ἥ]c οἱ λόφοι ἑκατέρωθεν ἔχου-
[cι - - - - - - - -]η[. . . . πε]ρὶ Ceιραϊκὴν γῆν καὶ
Δαίνηρον νέμεcθ[αι Φι]λίππουc, καθάπερ ἔδω-
κε Φίλιπποc· τὴν δὲ [ὕλ]ην τὴν ἐν Δυ[cώρ]ῳι μη-
θένα πωλεῖν, τέως ἡ πρεcβεία πά[λιν παρ' Ἀλε]-
ξάνδρου ἐπανέλ[θ]ηι· τὰ δὲ ἕλη ε[ἶναι πάντα]
Φιλίππων ἕως γεφύρας.

vacat

2: [Φιλιππ]ήc[ιοι]: Missitzis; rejected as the proper fourth-century ethnic for Philippi by Hatzopoulos (elsewhere in this inscription the ethnic is Φιλιππεῖc). || 5–6: προcτελοῦc[ι μιc|θὸν]: Vatin. || 6: [μερίcαι τ]ὴν ἀργόν: Vatin. || 7: τοῖc Φιλίπ[ποι]c Φιλώταν καὶ Λεονν[ᾶτον]: Vatin. || 11: [ἐπειcβεβήκ]αcιν: Vatin. || 13: ἐξελεῖν δ[ὲ]: Vatin. || 17: μ[ετρήcαντας]: Vatin. τ[ὴ]ν μὲν ἄ[λλην]: Vatin. || 18: ν[έμεcθαι Φιλίππου]c: Vatin. || 25: τὴν δὲ γῆν: Vatin. || 26–27: πα[ρὰ τοῦ Ἀλεξ]|άνδρου: Vatin. || 27: ε[ἶναι τῶν]: Vatin.

Although the subject matter of this inscription is in some ways quite clear, in other ways it raises a number of questions. The focus of the document is a boundary settlement between the city of Philippi and its Thracian neighbours, including regulations for the use of apparently disputed land. An embassy was sent from Philippi to Alexander III, and the king responded with decisions that are in part preserved in the fragments of this inscription. There was a question of fallow land, which was to be worked by Philippi. Surveys and delimitation of territory were to be carried out, in part at least by Philotas and Leonnatos, probably the famous Companions of Alexander. Part of the dispute may have been over a gradual penetration or encroachment into certain territories by the Thracians. While Philippi was granted some land, the claims of the neighbouring Thracians were also upheld; they were to continue to enjoy the produce of a particular region or regions that had been granted to them in the past by Philip and perhaps more recently by Alexander himself.[1]

1. The term καρπίζεcθαι appears in other boundary arbitrations and delimitations, as a qualification of the claim that a state might have on a particular territory. In **158** the term is employed to flesh out the picture of complete possession: "to have, to hold and to enjoy the fruits" (ἔχειν κατέχειν τε καρπίζεcθαι, II, line 54); elsewhere the term clearly limits a claim to the right of usufruct without necessarily granting possession; cf. **40**. The latter seems likely in the case of the Thracian grant.

What remains unclear is whether these regulations were included in a letter to Philippi from the embassy that had been sent to the Macedonian court (Vatin), a royal διάγραμμα of Alexander himself (Missitzis), or simply an informal communiqué of the embassy's activity (Hatzopoulos). Problems arise with all of these interpretations and the dates that the various authors propose. The obvious termini for this document are Alexander's accession in 336 and the execution of Philotas in 330. Both Vatin and Missitzis assigned the events described in the inscription to the years 335–334, while Philotas and Leonnatos were still in Europe. There is no evidence that either of them ever went on a mission from Asia to Macedonia between 334 and 330, and it would be stretching historical credibility to suggest that this inscription proves that they did so.

If we are to believe that the Philotas and Leonnatos named here were indeed the Companions of Alexander, and that they did in fact settle Philippi's land dispute, then a date of 335 or 334 does seem most reasonable. But Hatzopoulos argues that the delimitation was never carried out and that if it had been, then the delimitation itself would have been inscribed and not simply the general principles behind it. He therefore believes that a later date for the Philippian embassy and Alexander's regulations is possible. He suggests that the ambassadors from Philippi could have gone to Persia with the reinforcements sent by Antipater in late 331 and made their case to Alexander in Persepolis. They would then have lost contact with him, and with Philotas and Leonnatos, when Alexander headed into the Eastern empire. All they had for their efforts were the pronouncements made by the king on the spot, and the promise of a future land settlement, a promise that remained unfulfilled.

Hatzopoulos's arguments, however, raise certain doubts. It is difficult to believe that Alexander in Persepolis in 330, in spite of the dismissal of the Greek allies and the possible expectations of the Macedonians, could have even contemplated dispatching Philotas and Leonnatos to Macedon. Furthermore, in spite of Hatzopoulos's contentions, there is no proof that a delimitation was *not* carried out. It was a common enough practice to inscribe not only the final findings of a boundary commission but also any other documents that might have a bearing on the case, such as letters inviting states to go to arbitration, royal decrees, ad hoc agreements laying down guidelines, resumés of ambassadorial activity, and so on.[2] The fact that a preliminary document of sorts (which the present inscription appears to be) was formally inscribed is no proof that the boundary settlement never occurred. There seems therefore no reason to suppose that Philotas and Leonnatos did not carry out this task; we should probably still be assigning it to the first years of Alexander's reign.[3]

2. Cf. **120**, **131**, **153**, **164**, **170**.

3. For further discussion of the possible circumstances of this inscription see the articles by Badian and Hammond.

6. Alexander III calls for a boundary settlement between Aspendos and a neighbour, perhaps Side (early 333)

Arrian *Anabasis* 1.27.4.

Meyer, *Grenzen*, p. 11; E. Badian, in *Ancient Society and Institutions: Studies Presented to V. Ehrenberg* (Oxford, 1966) p. 49; Schmitt 405; A. B. Bosworth, *Historical Commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander* I (Oxford, 1980) pp. 168–69; Hammond/Walbank, *Macedonia,* vol. 3, pp. 75–76.

'Ομήρους δὲ δοῦναι σφῶν τοὺς δυνατωτάτους ἐκέλευσεν καὶ τοὺς ἵππους, οὓς πρόσθεν ὡμολόγησαν, καὶ ἑκατὸν τάλαντα ἀντὶ τῶν πεντήκοντα, καὶ πείθεσθαι τῷ σατράπῃ τῷ ⟨ὑπ'⟩ Ἀλεξάνδρου ταχθέντι καὶ φόρους ἀποφέρειν ὅσα ἔτη Μακεδόσι, καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς χώρας διακριθῆναι, ἣν τῶν προσχώρων οὖσαν βίᾳ κατέχειν ἐν αἰτίᾳ ἦσαν.

Throughout his campaigns Alexander maintained a policy of making generous settlements with those states, small or large, who came over to his side voluntarily and remained faithful to him. The corollary to this policy was that he was quick to impose harsh terms on those who betrayed their agreements with him. His treatment of Aspendos in southern Asia Minor illustrates this rule. When the people of Aspendos forsook their agreement with Alexander he immediately, and much to their surprise, laid siege to the town. The Aspendians tried to persuade Alexander to take them back into his alliance on the terms of their old agreement. Having been betrayed once, he refused and demanded a harsher settlement: they were to provide hostages, an immediate delivery of horses previously promised, and a financial contribution that was twice their original assessment. In addition they were to pay a yearly tribute to the Macedonian treasury.

The Aspendians also suffered in their territorial holdings. As far as we can tell, Aspendos had had an outstanding dispute over a certain border with one of its neighbours, perhaps Side.[1] Aspendos was accused of having annexed the territory forcibly. An adjudication was now to be held, and it would not be surprising if we discovered that Aspendos lost.[2] Alexander had apparently ignored this dispute previously; Arrian's account implies that the territorial arbitration between Aspendos and its neighbour was just one more disadvantage imposed on Aspendos as punishment. This particular instance of arbitration is a good example of the kind of political manipulation to which the institution could be subjected.[3]

1. Bosworth suggests Side on the strength of the recorded hostility between Aspendos and Side in 218 B.C. (Polyb. 5.73.4).

2. See Badian, p. 49.

3. Cf. Philip II's treatment of Sparta: Piccirilli 60, 61.

7. Various states request adjudications from Alexander III (323)

I: Arrian *Anabasis* 7.15.4–5.
II: Diodoros 17.113.3.

I: Arrian *Anabasis* 7.15.4–5

Κατιόντι δὲ αὐτῷ εἰς Βαβυλῶνα Λιβύων τε πρεσβεῖαι ἐνετύγχανον ἐπαινούντων τε καὶ στεφανούντων ἐπὶ τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῆς Ἀσίας, καὶ ἐξ Ἰταλίας Βρέττιοί τε καὶ Λευκανοὶ καὶ Τυρρηνοὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἐπρέσβευον. καὶ Καρχηδονίους τότε πρεσβεῦσαι λέγεται καὶ ἀπὸ Αἰθιόπων πρέσβεις ἐλθεῖν καὶ Σκυθῶν τῶν ἐκ τῆς Εὐρώπης, καὶ Κελτοὺς καὶ Ἴβηρας, ὑπὲρ φιλίας δεησομένους· ὧν τά τε ὀνόματα καὶ τὰς σκευὰς τότε πρῶτον ὀφθῆναι πρὸς Ἑλλήνων τε καὶ Μακεδόνων. τοὺς δὲ καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν εἰς ἀλλήλους διαφορῶν λέγουσιν ὅτι Ἀλεξάνδρῳ διακρῖναι ἐπέτρεπον· καὶ τότε μάλιστα αὐτόν τε αὐτῷ Ἀλέξανδρον καὶ τοῖς ἀμφ' αὐτὸν φανῆναι γῆς τε ἁπάσης καὶ θαλάσσης κύριον.

II: Diodoros 17.113.3

Ὁ δὲ Ἀλέξανδρος ἀπογραφὴν λαβὼν τῶν πρέσβεων διέταξε τοῖς μὲν πρώτοις διδόναι τὰς ἀποκρίσεις καὶ τοῖς ἑξῆς ἅπασι. καὶ πρώτοις μὲν ἐχρημάτισε τοῖς ὑπὲρ τῶν ἱερῶν παραγεγενημένοις, δευτέροις δὲ τοῖς περὶ τῶν δωρεῶν ἥκουσιν, ἑξῆς δὲ τοῖς ἀμφισβητήσεις ἔχουσι πρὸς τοὺς ὁμόρους . . . .

The ancient sources report that in the last year of Alexander's life numerous embassies from all over the inhabited world came to see him.[1] Ambassadors not only from the Greek states but also from Libya and Carthage came to congratulate him on his victories, as did representatives from various Italian and Iberian peoples. In addition to congratulating Alexander on his victory and on becoming "King of Asia," many of these embassies would also have been concerned to assure Alexander of their goodwill, by employing expressions of friendship to turn aside any plans that Alexander might have had against them.

Some of these embassies were also concerned with matters of business that needed the attention of the king. A number of the Greek states, for example, were objecting to Alexander's exiles decree. Among the problems that some of these embassies, both Greek and non-Greek, wished to bring to Alexander's notice were disputes that the states had with one another.[2] Alexander, as the most prestigious individual in the world at this time, was asked to arbitrate these differences. We have no way of knowing any further details: how much

1. See Diod. 17.113.1; Justin 12.13.1–2; Arr. *Anab.* 7.19.1–2.

2. Diodoros says τοὺς ὁμόρους, which might suggest that some of these problems were typical boundary disputes.

attention Alexander may have given to these requests for arbitration, which specific peoples were involved, what the nature of the disputes was, or whether a judgement by Alexander was ever implemented. If Alexander did undertake to arbitrate various disputes, he would no doubt have delegated much of the detailed work to his agents, perhaps restricting his own contribution to the promulgation of general guidelines in the form of a διάγραμμα.[3]

8. Tarentum demands that Rome and the Samnites mediate their conflict (320 or 314?)

Livy 9.14.1.

Matthaei, *CQ*, pp. 250f.; Tod, p. 178; P. Wuilleumier, *Tarente* (Paris, 1939) pp. 92–93; Gruen, p. 100; G. C. Brauer, *Taras: Its History and Coinage* (New York, 1986) pp. 73–75.

> Per id tempus parantibus utrisque se ad proelium legati Tarentini interveniunt denuntiantes Samnitibus Romanisque, ut bellum omitterent: per utros stetisset, quo minus discederetur ab armis, adversus eos se pro alteris pugnaturos.

The great war between Rome and the Samnites, the so-called Second Samnite War, broke out in 326. Livy reports that prior to the declaration of war the Romans had invited the Samnites to refer their differences to the common friends and allies of both (8.23.8). The Samnites, however, refused arbitration and insisted on settling the matter by war. This refusal, according to the ethical context in which Livy presents it, made the Samnites responsible for the war. The guilt lay with them, and they acknowledged that fact (Livy 8.39 and 9.1.3). But five years later, in 321, the roles were reversed. The Samnites, desperate for peace and the retrieval of their ethical situation, offered extensive atonement for the hostilities (Livy 8.39). Along with their offer went, perhaps implicitly, the suggestion that they were now amenable to any request for arbitration (9.1.7). But this time it was the Romans who were adamant, not only about refusing to go to arbitration but also about demanding harsh terms from the Samnites.

Matthaei suggested that these reports of arbitration offered by both Romans and Samnites do not reflect the historical reality of the diplomatic relations between the two nations during the Second Samnite War. Arbitration was a Greek diplomatic institution, and relatively foreign to the Roman way of thought, not to mention the Samnite.[1] The notion of Romans and Samnites issuing arbitration challenges to each other may well have derived from a

3. Cf. the arbitration involving Philip V with Gonnoi and Herakleion (**54**).

1. See Gruen, pp. 99–100.

attention Alexander may have given to these requests for arbitration, which specific peoples were involved, what the nature of the disputes was, or whether a judgement by Alexander was ever implemented. If Alexander did undertake to arbitrate various disputes, he would no doubt have delegated much of the detailed work to his agents, perhaps restricting his own contribution to the promulgation of general guidelines in the form of a διάγραμμα.[3]

8. Tarentum demands that Rome and the Samnites mediate their conflict (320 or 314?)

Livy 9.14.1.

Matthaei, *CQ*, pp. 250f.; Tod, p. 178; P. Wuilleumier, *Tarente* (Paris, 1939) pp. 92–93; Gruen, p. 100; G. C. Brauer, *Taras: Its History and Coinage* (New York, 1986) pp. 73–75.

> Per id tempus parantibus utrisque se ad proelium legati Tarentini interveniunt denuntiantes Samnitibus Romanisque, ut bellum omitterent: per utros stetisset, quo minus discederetur ab armis, adversus eos se pro alteris pugnaturos.

The great war between Rome and the Samnites, the so-called Second Samnite War, broke out in 326. Livy reports that prior to the declaration of war the Romans had invited the Samnites to refer their differences to the common friends and allies of both (8.23.8). The Samnites, however, refused arbitration and insisted on settling the matter by war. This refusal, according to the ethical context in which Livy presents it, made the Samnites responsible for the war. The guilt lay with them, and they acknowledged that fact (Livy 8.39 and 9.1.3). But five years later, in 321, the roles were reversed. The Samnites, desperate for peace and the retrieval of their ethical situation, offered extensive atonement for the hostilities (Livy 8.39). Along with their offer went, perhaps implicitly, the suggestion that they were now amenable to any request for arbitration (9.1.7). But this time it was the Romans who were adamant, not only about refusing to go to arbitration but also about demanding harsh terms from the Samnites.

Matthaei suggested that these reports of arbitration offered by both Romans and Samnites do not reflect the historical reality of the diplomatic relations between the two nations during the Second Samnite War. Arbitration was a Greek diplomatic institution, and relatively foreign to the Roman way of thought, not to mention the Samnite.[1] The notion of Romans and Samnites issuing arbitration challenges to each other may well have derived from a

3. Cf. the arbitration involving Philip V with Gonnoi and Herakleion (**54**).

1. See Gruen, pp. 99–100.

Greek or Hellenizing annalist used as a source by Livy.[2] It would serve the purpose of reinforcing moral and ethical judgements about where the guilt lay in this war, and show it to have been waged by the Romans as a *iustum piumque bellum.*

The Roman and Samnite offers of arbitration, then, may be spurious. There is, however, another reference to arbitration in the context of this war, which, given the provenance of the offer to arbitrate, might have a greater claim to historical probability. In 320, according to Livy, shortly after the affair of the Caudine Forks, the Romans repudiated the humiliating peace concluded there by the consuls and took up arms against the Samnites again (9.8–12).[3] Before they fought, however, both Romans and Samnites were approached by envoys who had arrived from the Greek city of Tarentum. These envoys told the belligerents to lay down their arms; if one side persisted in continuing hostilities, the Tarentines would join the fight on the behalf of the other. Livy completes his story of the Tarentine intervention by saying that the Romans, while they pretended to lay aside their arms, had taken the auspices, seen that the gods would be on their side in the battle, and so were secretly determined to fight. The Roman consul Papirius, furthermore, was contemptuous of the Tarentine offer, since it came from a people incapable of managing their own internal affairs properly. The Samnites, for their part, had accepted the Tarentine suggestion and laid aside their arms. They were therefore stunned to see the Romans, who had also intimated that they would be willing to make peace, suddenly drawn up for battle, a battle that resulted in a Roman victory.

There is nothing implausible in the notion that Tarentum at some point in the course of the Samnite Wars might have offered its services as a mediator or arbitrator to the belligerents; as Greeks, the Tarentines might be expected to be more familiar with the institution than either the Romans or Samnites were. We might, however, question whether the incident took place exactly as described. For one thing, the tone of the Tarentine offer, as Livy presents it, is not so much that of an offer to arbitrate as it is of an attempt to dictate a settlement. This command is then underlined by the threat of military action. The Tarentines are presented as haughty and lacking in diplomacy, and their offer as it stands in Livy has little in common with accepted Greek procedures of mediation or arbitration. The whole affair seems to reflect not so much the actual Greek institution of arbitration as a possible Roman (or perhaps Livian) notion of what arbitration could mean: an enforced peace, not a judicial or

2. As suggested by Matthaei, *CQ*, p. 253.

3. Livy insists that the Caudine Peace was a *sponsio*, the guarantors of which were the consuls of 321, not a *foedus*. Hence Rome's repudiation of the peace and attempted surrender of the sponsoring consuls to the Samnites were legal acts and meant that, for Rome, the continued war could still be *iustum piumque*.

mediatory procedure. The Tarentine offer may have been misinterpreted or misrepresented by later generations.[4]

The date of the Tarentine episode may also be mistrusted. It is said to have occurred in 320, during the vengeful campaign undertaken by the Romans to wipe out the memory of the Caudine Forks.[5] But Livy's account of the Roman repudiation of the Caudine Peace has been called into question. It may be that the story of this repudiation was invented by annalists in order to fill the gap between the Caudine Peace and the year 316, a time during which the Romans evidently actually did abide by the *foedus* (not *sponsio*) with Samnium.[6] If this is so, then it seems likely that the Tarentine intervention is misplaced in 320. If it is to be retained as a historical fact, some other opportunity for it must be found. A logical date for it might be around 314. Although there is no independent evidence to warrant this assumption, the fact that the war had just broken out again might have inspired the Tarentines to make their offer now.[7]

9. Akrotatos of Sparta mediates a treaty for Apollonia and Illyria (315)

Diodoros 19.70.7.

Piper, pp. 10–11.

Ἀπενεχθεὶς δ' ὑπ' ἀνέμων εἰς τὸν Ἀδρίαν κατῆρε μὲν εἰς τὴν τῶν Ἀπολλωνιατῶν χώραν, καταλαβὼν δὲ τὴν πόλιν πολιορκουμένην ὑπὸ Γλαυκίου τοῦ βασιλέως τῶν Ἰλλυριῶν ἔλυσε τὴν πολιορκίαν, πείσας τὸν βασιλέα συνθήκας ποιήσασθαι πρὸς τοὺς Ἀπολλωνιάτας.

In spite of its much-reduced position as a hegemon after Leuktra in 371, Philip's settlement in 338, and the defeat at Megalopolis in 331, Sparta still retained its military reputation. Military expeditions abroad could prove useful for those kings who found life at home under the ephors too restrictive. The Agiad Akrotatos, son of Kleomenes II, was apparently unpopular enough at

4. In this context, it is interesting to compare another Livian account of an arrogant Greek offer to arbitrate (this one, unlike the Tarentine offer, almost certainly spurious): see Livy 44.14 and the discussion at **121**.

5. Brauer, while admitting that Livy's account is "no doubt partly imaginative," accepts a date of around 320 for Tarentum's diplomatic mission.

6. See E. T. Salmon, *Samnium and the Samnites* (Cambridge, 1967) pp. 228f.; Schmitt 416; and H. H. Scullard, *History of the Roman World*[4] (Methuen, 1980) pp. 134, 481.

7. See Wuilleumier, pp. 92–93 and the references cited there; see also E. J. Bickerman, *CPh* 42 (1947) p. 141.

mediatory procedure. The Tarentine offer may have been misinterpreted or misrepresented by later generations.[4]

The date of the Tarentine episode may also be mistrusted. It is said to have occurred in 320, during the vengeful campaign undertaken by the Romans to wipe out the memory of the Caudine Forks.[5] But Livy's account of the Roman repudiation of the Caudine Peace has been called into question. It may be that the story of this repudiation was invented by annalists in order to fill the gap between the Caudine Peace and the year 316, a time during which the Romans evidently actually did abide by the *foedus* (not *sponsio*) with Samnium.[6] If this is so, then it seems likely that the Tarentine intervention is misplaced in 320. If it is to be retained as a historical fact, some other opportunity for it must be found. A logical date for it might be around 314. Although there is no independent evidence to warrant this assumption, the fact that the war had just broken out again might have inspired the Tarentines to make their offer now.[7]

9. Akrotatos of Sparta mediates a treaty for Apollonia and Illyria (315)

Diodoros 19.70.7.

Piper, pp. 10–11.

Ἀπενεχθεὶς δ' ὑπ' ἀνέμων εἰς τὸν Ἀδρίαν κατῆρε μὲν εἰς τὴν τῶν Ἀπολλωνιατῶν χώραν, καταλαβὼν δὲ τὴν πόλιν πολιορκουμένην ὑπὸ Γλαυκίου τοῦ βασιλέως τῶν Ἰλλυριῶν ἔλυσε τὴν πολιορκίαν, πείσας τὸν βασιλέα συνθήκας ποιήσασθαι πρὸς τοὺς Ἀπολλωνιάτας.

In spite of its much-reduced position as a hegemon after Leuktra in 371, Philip's settlement in 338, and the defeat at Megalopolis in 331, Sparta still retained its military reputation. Military expeditions abroad could prove useful for those kings who found life at home under the ephors too restrictive. The Agiad Akrotatos, son of Kleomenes II, was apparently unpopular enough at

4. In this context, it is interesting to compare another Livian account of an arrogant Greek offer to arbitrate (this one, unlike the Tarentine offer, almost certainly spurious): see Livy 44.14 and the discussion at **121**.

5. Brauer, while admitting that Livy's account is "no doubt partly imaginative," accepts a date of around 320 for Tarentum's diplomatic mission.

6. See E. T. Salmon, *Samnium and the Samnites* (Cambridge, 1967) pp. 228f.; Schmitt 416; and H. H. Scullard, *History of the Roman World*[4] (Methuen, 1980) pp. 134, 481.

7. See Wuilleumier, pp. 92–93 and the references cited there; see also E. J. Bickerman, *CPh* 42 (1947) p. 141.

home for his outspokenness to have warranted physical violence from his enemies.[1] When some Syracusan exiles arrived in Sparta to ask for military aid on behalf of Akragas against Agathokles of Syracuse, Akrotatos leapt at the chance of leading a foreign military expedition. He left at once without awaiting the ephors' permission.

Diodoros tells us that it was while Akrotatos was on his way to Italy that he was blown off course and driven to make a landing at Apollonia in northwestern Greece. At that time Apollonia was under attack by Glaukias the Illyrian dynast. Akrotatos was apparently successful in putting an end to the war between the two. In addition he also effected a treaty between them, perhaps by acting as an impartial arbitrator of the agreement. We are told that Akrotatos's landing in northwestern Greece was purely fortuitous, the result of adverse weather patterns. It is not impossible, however, that Akrotatos planned his brief stopover. He may have envisioned the possibility of mediation and seen it as a chance to enhance his prestige. Or he may simply have wished to cement favourable relations with the region generally. If he planned to maintain the Sicilian link over time, then the coastal towns of northwestern Greece could prove to be of strategic value.

10. Hamilcar of Carthage settles the conflict between Messana and Agathokles of Syracuse (315–313)

I: Diodoros 19.65.5.
II: Diodoros 19.71.6–7.

E. A. Freeman, *History of Sicily* (London, 1892) pp. 238f.; H. Berve, *Die Herrschaft des Agathokles,* SBAW (Munich, 1952) pp. 28, 45–46; B. H. Warmington, *Carthage* (London, 1960) pp. 105f.; G. Picard/C. Picard, *The Life and Death of Carthage* (London, 1968) pp. 167f.; P. Lévêque, *Kôkalos* 14–15 (1968–69) pp. 142–43; Schmitt 424; S. N. Consolo Langher, *Archivio storico messinese* 3a, ser. 26–27 (1975–76) pp. 29–89; id., *Athenaeum* 58 (1980) pp. 309–39; L.-M. Hans, *Karthago und Sizilien* (Hildesheim, 1983) pp. 79f., 95, 101.

I: Diodoros 19.65.5

Καθ' ὃν δὴ χρόνον ἦκον ἐκ Καρχηδόνος πρέσβεις, οἱ τῷ μὲν Ἀγαθοκλεῖ περὶ τῶν πραχθέντων ἐπετίμησαν ὡς παραβαίνοντι τὰς συνθήκας, τοῖς δὲ

1. Akrotatos had opposed the decree lifting the dishonour from those Spartans who had survived the defeat at Megalopolis, and had, not surprisingly, offended all those affected by the decree.

home for his outspokenness to have warranted physical violence from his enemies.[1] When some Syracusan exiles arrived in Sparta to ask for military aid on behalf of Akragas against Agathokles of Syracuse, Akrotatos leapt at the chance of leading a foreign military expedition. He left at once without awaiting the ephors' permission.

Diodoros tells us that it was while Akrotatos was on his way to Italy that he was blown off course and driven to make a landing at Apollonia in northwestern Greece. At that time Apollonia was under attack by Glaukias the Illyrian dynast. Akrotatos was apparently successful in putting an end to the war between the two. In addition he also effected a treaty between them, perhaps by acting as an impartial arbitrator of the agreement. We are told that Akrotatos's landing in northwestern Greece was purely fortuitous, the result of adverse weather patterns. It is not impossible, however, that Akrotatos planned his brief stopover. He may have envisioned the possibility of mediation and seen it as a chance to enhance his prestige. Or he may simply have wished to cement favourable relations with the region generally. If he planned to maintain the Sicilian link over time, then the coastal towns of northwestern Greece could prove to be of strategic value.

10. Hamilcar of Carthage settles the conflict between Messana and Agathokles of Syracuse (315–313)

I: Diodoros 19.65.5.
II: Diodoros 19.71.6–7.

E. A. Freeman, *History of Sicily* (London, 1892) pp. 238f.; H. Berve, *Die Herrschaft des Agathokles,* SBAW (Munich, 1952) pp. 28, 45–46; B. H. Warmington, *Carthage* (London, 1960) pp. 105f.; G. Picard/C. Picard, *The Life and Death of Carthage* (London, 1968) pp. 167f.; P. Lévêque, *Kôkalos* 14–15 (1968–69) pp. 142–43; Schmitt 424; S. N. Consolo Langher, *Archivio storico messinese* 3a, ser. 26–27 (1975–76) pp. 29–89; id., *Athenaeum* 58 (1980) pp. 309–39; L.-M. Hans, *Karthago und Sizilien* (Hildesheim, 1983) pp. 79f., 95, 101.

I: Diodoros 19.65.5

Καθ' ὃν δὴ χρόνον ἦκον ἐκ Καρχηδόνος πρέσβεις, οἱ τῷ μὲν Ἀγαθοκλεῖ περὶ τῶν πραχθέντων ἐπετίμησαν ὡς παραβαίνοντι τὰς συνθήκας, τοῖς δὲ

1. Akrotatos had opposed the decree lifting the dishonour from those Spartans who had survived the defeat at Megalopolis, and had, not surprisingly, offended all those affected by the decree.

Μεσσηνίοις εἰρήνην παρεσκεύασαν καὶ τὸ φρούριον ἀναγκάσαντες ἀποκατα-
στῆσαι τὸν τύραννον ἀπέπλευσαν εἰς τὴν Λιβύην.

II: Diodoros 19.71.6–7

Τούτου δ' ἀπαλλαγέντος Ταραντῖνοι μὲν ἀπεσταλκότες εἰς Σικελίαν τὸν
στόλον μετεπέμψαντο, Ἀκραγαντῖνοι δὲ καὶ Γελῷοι καὶ Μεσσήνιοι κατέλυσαν
τὸν πρὸς Ἀγαθοκλέα πόλεμον, μεσιτεύσαντος τὰς συνθήκας Ἀμίλκου τοῦ
Καρχηδονίου. (7) ἦσαν δὲ τὰ κεφάλαια τῶν συντεθέντων τοιάδε, τῶν Ἑλλη-
νίδων πόλεων τῶν κατὰ Σικελίαν Ἡράκλειαν μὲν καὶ Σελινοῦντα καὶ πρὸς
ταύταις Ἰμέραν ὑπὸ Καρχηδονίοις τετάχθαι, καθὰ καὶ προϋπῆρχον, τὰς δ'
ἄλλας πάσας αὐτονόμους εἶναι, τὴν ἡγεμονίαν ἐχόντων Συρακοσίων.

Agathokles, tyrant of Syracuse in the late fourth century, was initially benefitted in his rise to power by his friendship with the Carthaginian power in Sicily, represented by the general Hamilcar (Justin 22.2.6). The tyrant, however, soon proved himself to be too ambitious an individual to have as a comfortable friend, and Carthaginian policy shifted to a stance of trying to restrict Agathokles. Although war eventually broke out between Agathokles and Carthage, the initial attempts of the latter to constrain the former consisted of a diplomatic offensive.[1] In 315, Agathokles was threatening to extend his control in Sicily through an attack on Messana. Envoys arrived from Carthage, and through their intervention he was persuaded to relinquish his attempt and make peace with Messana.

This peace, however, was not of long duration. The following year Messana combined in alliance with Akragas and Gela in order to try to withstand Agathokles. But with the enforced departure of their general, the Spartan Akrotatos, and the subsequent loss of their ally Tarentum, the anti-Agathokles alliance quickly dissolved again. Akragas, Gela, and Messana were forced to put an end to the war against the tyrant. In coming to an agreement with him, they once again had the services of a Carthaginian mediator: Hamilcar. In the treaty as mediated by Hamilcar it was stipulated that Herakleia, Selinous, and Himera were to be under Carthaginian domination, while all the other Sicilian Greek cities were to be "autonomous, under the hegemony of Syracuse."

Diodoros says that Hamilcar acted as a mediator or an arbitrator (μεσιτεύειν) in bringing about the peace between Agathokles and Messana and the others. Insofar as he helped to establish a peace this may be true, but Diodoros may be seeing Hamilcar's activity through naïve eyes. The actual terms of the treaty read more like an agreement between Syracuse and Carthage to share the benefits of Sicily than an equitable peace between Agathokles and the Greek states. The

1. For an earlier (410 B.C.) Carthaginian diplomatic intervention in Sicilian disputes see Piccirilli 32.

terms of this agreement were ambiguous, and obviously capable of varying constructions. While Messana was one of the parties to the settlement, we find Messana not long afterwards at war with Agathokles again (Diod. 19.102). Perhaps it had failed to recognize Syracusan "hegemony" (at the expense of its own autonomy) as much as Agathokles might have deemed appropriate. The agreement with Agathokles apparently caused difficulties also for Hamilcar, if we believe Justin, probably because it disadvantaged the other significant Sicilian cities vis-à-vis the Syracusan tyrant. If it was now the policy of Carthage to try to weaken Agathokles, Hamilcar had not done well in recognizing Syracusan hegemony over much of Greek Sicily. He was evidently heavily fined for this diplomatic faux pas, and it was also the last significant act of his career (Justin 22.2–3).

11. Antigonos I adjudicates the issue of the Lokrian maiden tribute (c. 305?)

Aelian *Varia historia* fragment 47 (ed. Hercher [Leipzig, 1866] vol. 2, p. 205; reconstructed from various Suda entries).

A. Wilhelm, *JÖAI* 14 (1911) pp. 163–256, especially pp. 186–88; A. Nikitsky, *ZMNP* 43 (1913) pp. 1–100 (in Russian); P. Roussel, *REG* 26 (1913) pp. 460–63; A. J. Reinach, *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 69 (1914) pp. 12–53; A. Momigliano, *CQ* 39 (1945) pp. 49–53; Lerat, pp. 19–22, 137, 156–58; G. L. Huxley, *Ancient Society and Institutions* (Oxford, 1966) pp. 147–64; G. Klaffenbach, *IG* IX^2 1.3.706 (the Lokrian maiden inscription); Schmitt 472, p. 123; P. Vidal-Naquet, in *Le monde grec: Hommages à Claire Préaux* (Brussels, 1975) pp. 496–507; Gruen, p. 98; D. D. Hughes, *Human Sacrifice in Ancient Greece* (London, 1991) pp. 166–84.

Ὁ Ἀπόλλων φησὶ πρὸς Λοκροὺς μὴ ἂν αὐτοῖς τὸ δεινὸν λωφῆσαι, εἰ μὴ πέμποιεν ἀνὰ πᾶν ἔτος δύο παρθένους ἐς τὴν Ἴλιον τῇ Ἀθηνᾷ, Κασάνδρας ποινήν, "ἕως ἂν ἱλεώσητε τὴν θεόν."

καὶ αἵ γε πεμφθεῖσαι κατεγήρασαν ἐν τῇ Τροίᾳ, τῶν διαδόχων μὴ ἀφικνουμένων.

αἳ δὲ γυναῖκες ἔτικτον ἔμπηρα καὶ τέρατα· οἳ δὲ τῶν τετολμημένων σφίσι λήθην καταχέαντες ἦκον ἐς Δελφούς.

οὖκουν ἐδέχετο αὐτοὺς τὸ μαντεῖον, τοῦ θεοῦ μηνίοντος αὐτοῖς. καὶ λιπαρούντων μαθεῖν τὴν αἰτίαν τοῦ κότου, ὀψέ ποτε χρῆσαι.

καὶ τὸ ἐλλειφθὲν κατὰ τὰς παρθένους προφέρει αὐτοῖς.

οἳ δὲ (οὐδὲ γὰρ ἔσχον ἀνήνασθαι τὸ πρόσταγμα) ἐπ' Ἀντιγόνῳ τίθενται τὴν κρίσιν ὑπὲρ τοῦ τίνα χρὴ Λοκρικὴν πόλιν πέμπειν δασμόν.

ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς Ἀντίγονος, ἐφεθέν οἱ δικάσαι προσέταξε κλήρῳ διακριθῆναι.

One of the more curious and intriguing religious customs of ancient Greece was the practice that has come to be known as the Lokrian maiden tribute.

terms of this agreement were ambiguous, and obviously capable of varying constructions. While Messana was one of the parties to the settlement, we find Messana not long afterwards at war with Agathokles again (Diod. 19.102). Perhaps it had failed to recognize Syracusan "hegemony" (at the expense of its own autonomy) as much as Agathokles might have deemed appropriate. The agreement with Agathokles apparently caused difficulties also for Hamilcar, if we believe Justin, probably because it disadvantaged the other significant Sicilian cities vis-à-vis the Syracusan tyrant. If it was now the policy of Carthage to try to weaken Agathokles, Hamilcar had not done well in recognizing Syracusan hegemony over much of Greek Sicily. He was evidently heavily fined for this diplomatic faux pas, and it was also the last significant act of his career (Justin 22.2–3).

11. Antigonos I adjudicates the issue of the Lokrian maiden tribute (c. 305?)

Aelian *Varia historia* fragment 47 (ed. Hercher [Leipzig, 1866] vol. 2, p. 205; reconstructed from various Suda entries).

A. Wilhelm, *JÖAI* 14 (1911) pp. 163–256, especially pp. 186–88; A. Nikitsky, *ZMNP* 43 (1913) pp. 1–100 (in Russian); P. Roussel, *REG* 26 (1913) pp. 460–63; A. J. Reinach, *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 69 (1914) pp. 12–53; A. Momigliano, *CQ* 39 (1945) pp. 49–53; Lerat, pp. 19–22, 137, 156–58; G. L. Huxley, *Ancient Society and Institutions* (Oxford, 1966) pp. 147–64; G. Klaffenbach, *IG* IX^2 1.3.706 (the Lokrian maiden inscription); Schmitt 472, p. 123; P. Vidal-Naquet, in *Le monde grec: Hommages à Claire Préaux* (Brussels, 1975) pp. 496–507; Gruen, p. 98; D. D. Hughes, *Human Sacrifice in Ancient Greece* (London, 1991) pp. 166–84.

Ὁ Ἀπόλλων φησὶ πρὸς Λοκροὺς μὴ ἂν αὐτοῖς τὸ δεινὸν λωφῆσαι, εἰ μὴ πέμποιεν ἀνὰ πᾶν ἔτος δύο παρθένους ἐς τὴν Ἴλιον τῇ Ἀθηνᾷ, Κασάνδρας ποινήν, "ἕως ἂν ἱλεώσητε τὴν θεόν."

καὶ αἵ γε πεμφθεῖσαι κατεγήρασαν ἐν τῇ Τροίᾳ, τῶν διαδόχων μὴ ἀφικνουμένων.

αἳ δὲ γυναῖκες ἔτικτον ἔμπηρα καὶ τέρατα· οἳ δὲ τῶν τετολμημένων σφίσι λήθην καταχέαντες ἦκον ἐς Δελφούς.

οὖκουν ἐδέχετο αὐτοὺς τὸ μαντεῖον, τοῦ θεοῦ μηνίοντος αὐτοῖς. καὶ λιπαρούντων μαθεῖν τὴν αἰτίαν τοῦ κότου, ὀψέ ποτε χρῆσαι.

καὶ τὸ ἐλλειφθὲν κατὰ τὰς παρθένους προφέρει αὐτοῖς.

οἳ δὲ (οὐδὲ γὰρ ἔσχον ἀνήνασθαι τὸ πρόσταγμα) ἐπ' Ἀντιγόνῳ τίθενται τὴν κρίσιν ὑπὲρ τοῦ τίνα χρὴ Λοκρικὴν πόλιν πέμπειν δασμόν.

ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς Ἀντίγονος, ἐφεθέν οἱ δικάσαι προσέταξε κλήρῳ διακριθῆναι.

One of the more curious and intriguing religious customs of ancient Greece was the practice that has come to be known as the Lokrian maiden tribute.

This tradition traced its roots to the mythical treatment of the Trojan princess Kassandra by Aias, son of Oileus. In the sack of Troy she was dragged from her sanctuary at the image of Athena and, according to some versions of the myth, raped by the Greek warrior. In historical times, in recompense for this outrage, the putative descendants of Aias, the Lokrians, were obliged to send two maidens on a regular basis into the service of Athena Ilias at Troy. The maidens were to fulfill a number of duties to the goddess, while living in poverty and having the social standing of pariahs.[1]

The regulation of the Lokrian tribute in the Hellenistic age is best known from an inscription of the early third century that informs us that the polis of Naryx (in east Lokris), and more particularly the clan of the Aianteioi, took on the onus of providing the maidens.[2] The arrangements reflected in this inscription should be connected to efforts to revitalize the tribute, which had evidently lapsed during the fourth century. But the inscription is not the only evidence for the renewal of the tribute and in fact probably reflects a secondary stage in that renewal. The passage from Aelian, quoted above, points to the original impulse behind the third-century revival. The Lokrians were originally obliged to send the maiden tribute by the command of Apollo. In the wake of the Third Sacred War and the general fighting in Greece in the latter half of the fourth century, the Lokrian obligations had gone unfulfilled.[3] The maidens who had gone to Troy grew old there and were not replaced by successors. As for the Lokrians themselves, they began to suffer from a series of monstrous births. Upon consultation with Delphi, it was learned that they were being punished for the neglect of their duties to Athena Ilias. But the issue of the tribute was not a straightforward matter. There was some disagreement among the Lokrian cities as to where the actual rights and obligations lay. In order for the maiden tribute to be reinstated, some arrangement had to be made that would assign responsibility. The Lokrians therefore turned to a King Antigonos and requested an arbitration to settle the matter. His final judgement was that the city responsible for sending the maidens should be chosen by lot.

One of the major questions posed by Aelian's notice concerns which Antigonid king performed this arbitration. One thing seems clear: since the inscription assigning responsibility to the Aianteioi of Naryx appears to represent a later development in the third-century renewal, and since this inscription belongs to the first half of the third century B.C., Antigonos III is not in the running

1. Sch. to Lykoph. *Alex.* 1141f. See some of the secondary literature for discussions of the duration and frequency of the maidens' service.

2. See *IG* IX^2 1.3.706 (= Schwyzer 366; Buck 60; Schmitt 472).

3. Sch. to Lykoph. *Alex.* 1141; [Apollod.] *Epit.* 6.22. This lapse may have occurred after the destruction of Naryx in 352 B.C. (Diod. 16.38.5).

here.[4] It is perhaps natural to think of an Antigonos who would have some more or less direct connection with Lokris, since the arbitration was between the Lokrian cities. This would point to Antigonos II, and some scholars, such as Momigliano, support the identification of Aelian's Antigonos with Gonatas.

But while it might be natural to identify Antigonos with a king who had some connection with Lokris, it would be just as natural to look for a king with some connection to Ilion. Ilion itself was not involved in this arbitration in any active way; but its Athena sanctuary would benefit from an expeditious settlement of the matter. An association with Ilion of course suggests Gonatas's grandfather, Antigonos I, who showed an evident interest in the affairs of the region.[5] His involvement in Ilion, and the small *koinon* centering on the Athena sanctuary there, might have made him a natural choice, sometime in the last decade of the fourth century, to settle the Lokrian question. He could offer the neutrality of an outsider and the interest of someone already concerned with the issue. The goodwill generated by the reputation that Antigonos and Demetrios were building up on the Greek mainland as "liberators" may have also been influential.

The notice in Aelian, reconstructed and uncertain as it is, is also very brief. We are told only that Antigonos informed the Lokrian states that they should settle which city was to be responsible by lot. This leaves unanswered the question of whether the Lokrians were to decide once and for all on a permanent obligation for one city, or whether they were to have regular recourse to the lot and rotate the duties among the various states. Regardless of the intentions of Antigonos in this arbitration, it seems that his resolution of the matter did not survive for any great length of time. It was evidently superseded by the new arrangements, which assigned the duties to Naryx and the Aianteioi.

12. Several states mediate between Rhodes and Demetrios Poliorketes (304)

I: Diodoros 20.95.4-5.
II: Diodoros 20.98.2-3.
III: Plutarch *Demetrios* 22.8.
IV: Diodoros 20.99.3.

Sonne 14; Berard 40; H. van Gelder, *Geschichte der alten Rhodier* (The Hague, 1900) pp. 105f.; Ferguson, *Athens*, p. 117; Raeder, p. 141; G. Elkeles, "Demetrios

4. Schmitt assigns a probable date of before 272 to the inscription. But Wilhelm points out that Antigonos Doson has had supporters (*JÖAI*, p. 186).

5. For a discussion of Antigonos's interest in the Troad, see Billows, pp. 218–19; C. Wehrli, *Antigone et Démétrios* (Geneva, 1969) p. 87; Huxley, p. 152; Vidal-Naquet, p. 503.

here.[4] It is perhaps natural to think of an Antigonos who would have some more or less direct connection with Lokris, since the arbitration was between the Lokrian cities. This would point to Antigonos II, and some scholars, such as Momigliano, support the identification of Aelian's Antigonos with Gonatas.

But while it might be natural to identify Antigonos with a king who had some connection with Lokris, it would be just as natural to look for a king with some connection to Ilion. Ilion itself was not involved in this arbitration in any active way; but its Athena sanctuary would benefit from an expeditious settlement of the matter. An association with Ilion of course suggests Gonatas's grandfather, Antigonos I, who showed an evident interest in the affairs of the region.[5] His involvement in Ilion, and the small *koinon* centering on the Athena sanctuary there, might have made him a natural choice, sometime in the last decade of the fourth century, to settle the Lokrian question. He could offer the neutrality of an outsider and the interest of someone already concerned with the issue. The goodwill generated by the reputation that Antigonos and Demetrios were building up on the Greek mainland as "liberators" may have also been influential.

The notice in Aelian, reconstructed and uncertain as it is, is also very brief. We are told only that Antigonos informed the Lokrian states that they should settle which city was to be responsible by lot. This leaves unanswered the question of whether the Lokrians were to decide once and for all on a permanent obligation for one city, or whether they were to have regular recourse to the lot and rotate the duties among the various states. Regardless of the intentions of Antigonos in this arbitration, it seems that his resolution of the matter did not survive for any great length of time. It was evidently superseded by the new arrangements, which assigned the duties to Naryx and the Aianteioi.

12. Several states mediate between Rhodes and Demetrios Poliorketes (304)

I: Diodoros 20.95.4-5.
II: Diodoros 20.98.2-3.
III: Plutarch *Demetrios* 22.8.
IV: Diodoros 20.99.3.

Sonne 14; Berard 40; H. van Gelder, *Geschichte der alten Rhodier* (The Hague, 1900) pp. 105f.; Ferguson, *Athens*, p. 117; Raeder, p. 141; G. Elkeles, "Demetrios

4. Schmitt assigns a probable date of before 272 to the inscription. But Wilhelm points out that Antigonos Doson has had supporters (*JÖAI*, p. 186).

5. For a discussion of Antigonos's interest in the Troad, see Billows, pp. 218–19; C. Wehrli, *Antigone et Démétrios* (Geneva, 1969) p. 87; Huxley, p. 152; Vidal-Naquet, p. 503.

der Städtebelagerer" (Diss., Breslau, 1941) pp. 20–23; E. Manni, *Demetrio Poliorcete* (Rome, 1951) p. 31; C. Wehrli, *Antigone et Démétrios* (Geneva, 1968) pp. 147–48; Schmitt 442; H. Hauben, *Historia* 26 (1977) p. 338; Will, vol. 1, pp. 70, 73–74; Austin 39; Berthold, pp. 74f.; Hammond/Walbank, *Macedonia*, vol. 3, pp. 172, 176; Billows, pp. 207–8.

I: Diodoros 20.95.4–5

Διαceίοντος δ'αὐτοῦ τοῖc κριοῖc καὶ τοῖc πετροβόλοις τὰ τείχη παρεγενήθηcαν Κνιδίων πρέcβειc, ἀξιοῦντεc ἐπιcχεῖν καὶ πείcειν ἐπαγγελλόμενοι τοὺc Ῥοδίουc δέχεcθαι τὰ δυνατώτατα τῶν προcταγμάτων. (5) ἀνέντοc δὲ τοῦ βαcιλέωc καὶ τῶν πρέcβεων δεῦρο κἀκεῖcε πολλὰ διαλεχθέντων πέραc οὐ δυναμένων cυμφωνῆcαι πάλιν ἐνηργεῖτο τὰ τῆc πολιορκίαc.

II: Diodoros 20.98.2–3

Καθ' ὃν δὴ χρόνον ἦκον πρὸc τὸν Δημήτριον πρέcβειc παρά τε Ἀθηναίων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων Ἑλληνίδων πόλεων, τὸν ἀριθμὸν μὲν ὄντεc ὑπὲρ τοὺc πεντήκοντα, πάντεc δὲ ἀξιοῦντεc διαλύcαcθαι τὸν βαcιλέα πρὸc τοὺc Ῥοδίουc. (3) γενομένων οὖν ἀνοχῶν καὶ πολλῶν καὶ παντοδαπῶν ῥηθέντων λόγων πρός τε τὸν δῆμον καὶ πρὸc τοὺc περὶ τὸν Δημήτριον οὐδαμῶc ἐδυνήθηcαν cυμφωνῆcαι· διόπερ οἱ πρέcβειc ἀπῆλθον ἄπρακτοι.

III: Plutarch *Demetrios* 22.8

Τῶν δὲ Ῥοδίων κατεξανιcταμένων τοῦ πολέμου, δεόμενον προφάcεωc τὸν Δημήτριον Ἀθηναῖοι παραγενόμενοι διήλλαξαν ἐπὶ τῷ cυμμαχεῖν Ῥοδίουc Ἀντιγόνῳ καὶ Δημητρίῳ πλὴν ἐπὶ Πτολεμαῖον.

IV: Diodoros 20.99.3

Καθ' ὃν δὴ χρόνον τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν Αἰτωλῶν ἀποcτείλαντοc πρεcβευτὰc περὶ διαλύcεων οἱ Ῥόδιοι cυνέθεντο πρὸc Δημήτριον ἐπὶ τοῖcδε, αὐτόνομον καὶ ἀφρούρητον εἶναι τὴν πόλιν καὶ ἔχειν τὰc ἰδίαc προcόδουc, cυμμαχεῖν δὲ Ῥοδίουc Ἀντιγόνῳ πλὴν ἐὰν ἐπὶ Πτολεμαῖον cτρατεύηται, καὶ δοῦναι τῶν πολιτῶν ὁμήρουc ἑκατὸν οὕc ἂν ἀπογράψηται Δημήτριοc πλὴν τῶν ἀρχὰc ἐχόντων.

Through the years 306–305 Antigonos Monophthalmos attempted to coerce Rhodes into an alliance as part of his campaign against Ptolemy of Egypt. The Rhodians, who had friendly relations with Egypt, refused. By the summer of 305, after Ptolemy's defeat at Cyprus, Antigonos's son Demetrios had begun his famous siege of the city (Diod. 20.81f.). The Rhodians held out for a year against Demetrios, with the help of some rather limited support from Ptolemy, Kassander, and Lysimachos. Towards the middle of 304, Demetrios received word from Antigonos to end the siege, as the latter could no longer afford to

devote a military force to Rhodes.[1] Ptolemy had also been advising Rhodes to accept reasonable terms. At this juncture a foreign embassy arrived and offered to mediate a peace between Rhodes and Demetrios. This peace was eventually established on the basis of a symmachy with Antigonos that exempted the Rhodians from taking part in any action against Ptolemy (Diod. 20.99.3; Plut. *Demetr.* 22.8).

It is clear from the sources that the mediation of some Greek state or states was instrumental in establishing the peace between Rhodes and the Antigonids; but some confusion exists over just which third parties were involved. It seems that a number of attempts were made. Early in the siege, an embassy had been sent by the Knidians, an embassy that had sought unsuccessfully to mediate between the two sides.[2] Subsequently a greater effort was made by over fifty envoys from Athens and other states, an effort that met with some temporary success but that failed in the end (Diod. 20.98.2–3). Plutarch reports that the envoys who ultimately succeeded in putting an end to the hostilities were Athenian, a claim that seems reasonable given the friendly state of Athenian relations with Demetrios at this time.[3] These envoys, according to Plutarch, gave Demetrios the excuse he needed to stop the siege. It is possible, however, that Plutarch's source may have substituted "Athenians" for "Aitolians" here because he confused the final (successful) embassy with the embassy from Athens and several other Greek states, the embassy that Diodoros reports arrived earlier in the siege but was no more successful than that of Knidos (20.98).[4]

It seems unlikely that there was any adjudication or arbitration in its strictest sense involved in this peace settlement. But the restoration of a peaceful state of affairs between Rhodes and the Antigonids is one of the more significant, and certainly one of the more efficacious, examples of Hellenistic third-party diplomacy in action.

13. Antigonos I synoikises Lebedos and Teos (c. 303)

An inscription discovered in the Turkish cemetery at Teos, bearing two letters of Antigonos I. The stele has disappeared, and epigraphic details are unavailable.

1. See Elkeles, p. 22; Berthold, p. 77.

2. Diod. 20.95.1–5. Knidos was within Rhodes's economic sphere and would naturally have been affected adversely by the siege.

3. C. Habicht, *AJAH* 1 (1976) pp. 37–38.

4. See Tarn, *CAH* VI, p. 500; G. Klaffenbach, *IG* IX^2 1, p. xv. Sonne believes that the error here is Diodoros's, and that Athens was the state that finally succeeded in mediating the settlement.

devote a military force to Rhodes.[1] Ptolemy had also been advising Rhodes to accept reasonable terms. At this juncture a foreign embassy arrived and offered to mediate a peace between Rhodes and Demetrios. This peace was eventually established on the basis of a symmachy with Antigonos that exempted the Rhodians from taking part in any action against Ptolemy (Diod. 20.99.3; Plut. *Demetr.* 22.8).

It is clear from the sources that the mediation of some Greek state or states was instrumental in establishing the peace between Rhodes and the Antigonids; but some confusion exists over just which third parties were involved. It seems that a number of attempts were made. Early in the siege, an embassy had been sent by the Knidians, an embassy that had sought unsuccessfully to mediate between the two sides.[2] Subsequently a greater effort was made by over fifty envoys from Athens and other states, an effort that met with some temporary success but that failed in the end (Diod. 20.98.2–3). Plutarch reports that the envoys who ultimately succeeded in putting an end to the hostilities were Athenian, a claim that seems reasonable given the friendly state of Athenian relations with Demetrios at this time.[3] These envoys, according to Plutarch, gave Demetrios the excuse he needed to stop the siege. It is possible, however, that Plutarch's source may have substituted "Athenians" for "Aitolians" here because he confused the final (successful) embassy with the embassy from Athens and several other Greek states, the embassy that Diodoros reports arrived earlier in the siege but was no more successful than that of Knidos (20.98).[4]

It seems unlikely that there was any adjudication or arbitration in its strictest sense involved in this peace settlement. But the restoration of a peaceful state of affairs between Rhodes and the Antigonids is one of the more significant, and certainly one of the more efficacious, examples of Hellenistic third-party diplomacy in action.

13. Antigonos I synoikises Lebedos and Teos (c. 303)

An inscription discovered in the Turkish cemetery at Teos, bearing two letters of Antigonos I. The stele has disappeared, and epigraphic details are unavailable.

1. See Elkeles, p. 22; Berthold, p. 77.

2. Diod. 20.95.1–5. Knidos was within Rhodes's economic sphere and would naturally have been affected adversely by the siege.

3. C. Habicht, *AJAH* 1 (1976) pp. 37–38.

4. See Tarn, *CAH* VI, p. 500; G. Klaffenbach, *IG* IX^2 1, p. xv. Sonne believes that the error here is Diodoros's, and that Athens was the state that finally succeeded in mediating the settlement.

Only the relevant portions of the inscription (passages from the first letter) are cited here.

LeBas/Waddington 86; Hicks 149; W. Feldmann, *Dissertationum Philologicarum Argentoratensium IX* (Strasbourg, 1885) pp. 106f. Dittenberger, *SIG*^{2} 177; Michel 34; Dittenberger/Hiller von Gaertringen, *SIG*^{3} 344; F. Schroeter, "De Regum Hellenisticorum Epistulis" (Diss., Leipzig, 1931) 3, 4; *Welles, *RC* 3, 4.

E. Egger, *Études historiques sur les traités publics* (Paris, 1866) pp. 75f.; Sonne 62; Lenschau, *LS,* pp. 182–84; E. Szanto, *Das griechische Bürgerrecht* (Freiburg, 1892) pp. 108f.; Berard 36; E. Ziebarth, *WKPh* 12 (1895) pp. 283f.; U. Köhler, *SPAW* 1898, pp. 838–42; E. R. Bevan, *House of Seleucus* I (London, 1902) pp. 114f.; B. Haussoullier, *Études sur l'histoire de Milet* (Paris, 1902) pp. 22–24; H. Francotte, *Mélanges Nicole* (Geneva, 1905) pp. 135–48; Hitzig 30; Wilhelm, *Beiträge,* p. 21; Phillipson, p. 145; Raeder 30; B. Haussoullier, *Traité entre Delphes et Pellana* (Paris, 1917) pp. 102–5; Steinwenter, pp. 177, 192; P. Jouguet, *Macedonian Imperialism,* trans. M. R. Dobie (London, 1928) p. 350; *SEG* IV.618; V. Ehrenberg, *Hermes* 65 (1930) pp. 341, 351; A. Wilhelm, *Klio* 28 (1935) p. 280; Rostovtzeff, *SEHHW,* vol. 1, pp. 155–58; G. Klaffenbach, *Philologus* 97 (1948) pp. 179–80; Robert, *REG* 1948, 205a; id., *REG* 1955, 190; *SEG* XV.717; Préaux, p. 249; Gauthier, pp. 315–16; C. Préaux, *Le monde hellénistique* II (Paris, 1978) p. 423; Austin 40; Bagnall/Derow 7; Gruen, p. 98; Billows, pp. 213–15, 260.

I: Welles, *RC* 3, sec. 6, lines 24–30

Τὰ δὲ ἐγκλήματα καὶ τὰ συμβόλαια [τὰ ὑπάρχοντα ἑκα]-
[τέ]ροις, αὐτοὺς πρὸς αὐτοὺς διαλυθῆναι ἢ διακριθῆναι κ[ατὰ τοὺς ἑκατέρων]
[ν]όμους καὶ τὸ παρ' ἡμῶν διάγραμμα ἐν δυσὶν ἔτεσι ἀφ' οὗ ἂ[ν τὸ διάγραμμα? προ]-
[τ]εθῆι. ὅσα δέ ἐστιν ⟨ὑμῖν⟩ πρὸς τοὺς Λεβεδίους ἢ τοῖς Λεβεδίοις π[ρὸς ὑμᾶς, ποεῖν ἀμφοτέ]-
[ρ]ους συνθήκην, γράψασθαι δὲ τὴν συνθήκην, καὶ ἄν τι ἀντιλ[έγηται πρὸς τὴν]
[c]υνθήκην, ἐπικριθῆναι ἐν τῆι ἐκκλήτωι ⟨ἐν⟩ ἑξαμήνωι· ἔκκλητον [δὲ πόλιν γενέσθαι, κα]-
[θὰ] ἀμφότεροι συνωμολόγησαν, Μιτυλήνην.

II: Welles, *RC* 3, sec. 8, lines 43–52

§8 Εἰς δὲ τὸ λοιπὸν καὶ διδόναι [καὶ λαμβάνειν δίκας κατὰ νό]-
μους οὓς ἂν ὑπολαμβάνοιτε ἴσους ἀμφοτέροις εἶναι. ἀ[ποδεῖξαι δὲ ἑκατέρους]
νομογράφους τρεῖς μὴ νεωτέρους ἐτῶν τεσσεράκοντα [ὄντας ἀνεριθεύ]-
[τ]ους· οἱ δὲ αἱρεθέντες ὀμοσάντων γράψειν νόμους οὓς ἂ[ν νομίσωσιν βελ]-
τίστους εἶναι καὶ συνοίσειν τῆι πόλει. ὅταν δὲ ὀμόσωσιν, [γραψάντων οὓς ἂν ἡγή]-

[cω]νται ἴcους ἀμφοτέροις ἔcεcθαι καὶ ἐνεγκάντων ἐντὸ[c ἑξαμήνου· εἶναι δὲ]
[κ]αὶ ἄλλωι τῶι βουλομένωι γράψαντι νόμον ἐcφέρειν· τῶν δὲ [εἰcενεχθέντων ὅca]
μὲν ἂν ἐξ ὁμολογουμένων ὁ δῆμος ἐπικυρώcηι, χρᾶcθαι τού[τοις, ὅca δὲ ἀντιλεγό]-
μενα ἦι, ἀναπεμφθῆναι πρὸc ἡμᾶc, ὅπωc ἢ αὐτοὶ ἐπικρίνωμεν [ἢ πόλιν ἀποδείξω]-
[μ]εν τὴν ἐπικρινοῦcαν·

24–25: [τὰ ὑπάρχοντα ἀμφοτέ]|ροις: LeBas/Waddington, Hicks, Michel. || 25: αὐτοὺc πρὸc αὐτοὺc κτλ: LeBas/Waddington, Hicks. αὐτο⟨ῖ⟩c πρὸc αὐτούc: Klaffenbach. || 25: [κατὰ τοὺc πατρίουc]: LeBas/Waddington, Hicks, Michel. || 26–27: [τὸ διάγραμμα δια|τ]εθῆ·: LeBas/Waddington, Hicks. [τὸ πολίτευμα δια|τ]εθῆι: Feldmann. || 27: ⟨ὑμῖν⟩: Feldmann, *SIG*^{2}, *SIG*^{3}, Schroeter, Welles. || 27–28: [ποιῆcαι πρὸc ἀλλή|λ]ουc cυνθήκην: Feldmann. [ποῆcαι ἀμφοτέ]|ρουc cυνθήκην: Schroeter. || 29: ἐν τῆ ἐκκλήτῳ, ἑξαμήνῳ·: LeBas/Waddington, Hicks. ἐν τῆι ἐκκλήτωι ἑξαμήνωι (*sc.* δίκηι)·: Feldmann, Michel. ⟨ἐν⟩: *SIG*^{3}, Schroeter, Welles. || 29–30: ἔκκλητον [δὲ πόλιν αἱρεῖcθαι| ἀμφότεροι cυνωμολόγηcαν Μιτυλήνην.: LeBas/Waddington, Hicks, Michel. ἔκκλητον [δὲ πόλιν γενέcθαι]| ἀμφότεροι cυνωμολόγηcαν Μιτυλήνην.: Feldmann, *SIG*^{2}. || 44–45: §8 Δ[εῖ δὲ ὑμᾶc αἱρεῖcθαι| νομογράφουc κτλ: LeBas/Waddington, Hicks, Michel. || 45–46: [καὶ καλοὺc καὶ ἀγα|θ]οὺc: LeBas/Waddington, Hicks, Michel. || 51–52: [ἢ τὴν πόλιν ἀποδεικνύω|μ]εν τὴν ἐπικρινοῦcαν·: LeBas/Waddington, Hicks, Michel.

These two letters from Antigonos Monophthalmos to the people of Teos in Asia Minor dealt with the projected synoikism of the latter state and its neighbour Lebedos. The letters set out a number of regulations with respect to the proposed amalgamation of the two states. The date of this synoikism, which was apparently never fully carried out, fell in the last years of Antigonos's life, when he was already styling himself as king.[1]

The first section cited above (I) deals with outstanding suits within either city (ἐγκλήματα and cυμβόλαια),[2] and with suits between the two cities. The suits within each city were to be decided according to the existing laws of that city; but the two states were to establish a special agreement (ποεῖν ἀμφοτέρουc cυνθήκην) for the settlement of disputes between them. If either city should disagree with any point in this special agreement, then that dispute was to be submitted to Mytilene, the designated arbitrator (ἔκκλητοc

1. See the opening of the second letter: [Bαc]ιλεὺc Ἀντίγονοc Τηΐων τῆι βουλῆι καὶ τῶι δήμωι χαίρειν. The inhabitants of Lebedos never did move to Teos, as was intended; some years later Lysimachos moved the citizens of Lebedos, apparently still dwelling in their native city, to Ephesos.

2. Cf. **83**.

πόλις).[3] Any point under dispute had to be submitted within six months.[4] While the suits between citizens of the two states, which were the subject of the special agreement, were probably of a private nature, the agreement itself was a public matter between communities. Thus any arbitration about it was also a public matter and merits consideration here.

The second section (II) deals with the establishment of laws for the new state. Here too we see that some arbitration might be necessary before the synoikism could be carried out. The letter makes the request that any proposed laws about which there is some disagreement be submitted to Antigonos himself, who would either pass judgement on them or designate a third city to do so. This time there is no reference to a specific arbiter city approved by both sides. Antigonos merely implies that he will delegate one. If such disputed laws were decided upon by a truly disinterested third party, this would be more closely akin to true arbitration; but a subsequent section of the letter implies that Antigonos envisaged himself as both arbitrator and punisher in these disputes.[5]

Nevertheless, in other portions of his letter, Antigonos does adopt the tone of a neutral arbitrator. For instance, he speaks of having "judged" (ἐπικεκρίκαμεν, line 60) between the claims and desires of the two cities regarding the temporary use of a foreign law code. He also requests that any further disputed points about the synoikism that have not been foreseen be submitted to him for decision (lines 107–8). Here again Antigonos sounds the neutral arbitrator, but this may be more the result of a gracious style than a reflection of fact.[6] Like other Hellenistic monarchs, Antigonos no doubt was happy to oblige his subjects where it caused him no trouble, but there would have been no question of him allowing disruptive disputes between cities in his realm to continue. If arbitration were to fail, more direct methods would be used.

3. See Waddington (*ap.* LeBas/Waddington 86), who cites the *Etymologicum Magnum*: ἔκκλητος πόλις: ἣν ἂν ἐκκαλῆταί τις εἰς τὸ κρίνεσθαι; Feldmann, p. 124. For other examples of the ἔκκλητος πόλις, see **47**, **48**, **71**.

4. Feldmann's reading of these lines (pp. 123f.) would make them refer to ἡ ἔκκλητος ἑξάμηνος δίκη, "a reference to the semi-annual sitting of a court" (Welles, *RC*, p. 28). However, the term ἔκκλητος as applied to πόλις is more natural, especially with Hiller von Gaertringen's restoration of ἐν, and since it follows in the next phrase. See Schroeter, p. 50.

5. Lines 52–55: ἀναπέμψαι δὲ καὶ τοὺς συνομολογηθέν[τας νόμους, καὶ δια]|caφεῖν τούς τε ὑπὸ τῶν νομογράφων εἰσενεχθέντας καὶ τοὺς [ὑπ' ἄλλων γραφέντας,| ὅπω]c ἐάν τινες φαίνωνται μὴ τὰ βέλτιστα νομογραφοῦντες ἀλλ' [ἀνεπιτήδεια, αὐτοῖς]| ἐπιτιμῶμεν καὶ ζημιῶμεν. Cf. Welles, *RC*, p. 28; Bevan, vol. 1, pp. 114–15.

6. See Welles, *RC*, p. 26.

14. The constitution of the Hellenic League of Antigonos and Demetrios (302)

Twelve fragments of a limestone stele found in the Asklepieion at Epidauros. Inscribed in the upper part on both sides. The relevant passages are taken from sections II, III, and IV of Schmitt's arrangement.

J. Baunack, *Philologus* 54 (1895) p. 61, no. 6 and p. 24; Fränkel, *IG* IV.924; Wilhelm, *Attische Urkunden*, pp. 31f.; P. Kavvadias, *AE* 1918, pp. 128f., no. 3; S. B. Kougeas, *AE* 1921, pp. 6f.; A. Wilhelm, *AAWW* 1922, pp. 52–70, xv–xviii; U. Wilcken, *SPAW* 1922, pp. 122f., xviii; P. Roussel, *RA* 5.27 (1923) pp. 121f.; J. Hondius, *SEG* I.75; U. Wilcken, *SPAW* 1927, pp. 277f., xxvi; Hiller von Gaertringen, *IG* IV^2 1.68; Moretti, *ISE* 44; W. Peek, *ASAW* 60.2 (1969) pp. 19–22, no. 23; *Schmitt 446.

Ferguson, *Athens*, pp. 121–22; *SEG* II.56; J. A. O. Larsen, *CPh* 20 (1925) pp. 313–29; id., *CPh* 21 (1926) pp. 52–71; H. Bengtson, *Die Strategie in der hellenistischen Zeit* I (Munich, 1937) pp. 154f; L. Robert, *Hellenica* II (Paris, 1946) pp. 15–33; W. S. Ferguson, *Hesperia* 17 (1948) pp. 112–36; I. Calabi, *Athenaeum* 28 (1950) pp. 59–66; *SEG* XI.399; G. Daux, *AE* 1953–54, pp. 245–54; C. Wehrli, *Antigone et Démétrios* (Geneva, 1968) pp. 122–26; W. Peek, *ASAW* 60.2 (1969) pp. 19–22, no. 23; *SEG* XXV.381; Will, vol. 1, pp. 77–79; *SEG* XXX.107, XXXI.325; Harding, *TDGR* 138; Hammond/Walbank, *Macedonia*, vol. 3, pp. 176f.; Billows, pp. 228f.

I: Schmitt 446 II

[- - - -μὴ ἐξεῖναι δὲ ταῖς πόλ]ε̣ιν ἄλλο τι πράτ-
35 [τειν ἢ τὰ γεγραμμένα?· ἐὰν δέ τινες ἐναντίον τι πράττωσιν? ἢ λόγ]ωι ἢ ἔργωι, εἰσαγ-^{vv}
[γελλέτω περὶ αὐτῶν ὁ βουλόμενος εἰς τοὺς προέδρους?· οἱ δὲ σύν]εδροι κρινόντω-
[σαν, καὶ ἐὰν ἁλῶσι, τιμάτωσαν, ὅ, τι ἂν δοκῶσι ἄξιοι εἶναι παθ]εῖν ἢ ἀποτεῖσαι.^{vv}

36: [εἰς τοὺς συνέδρους· οἱ δὲ σύν]εδροι: Wilhelm.

II: Schmitt 446 III

[ὃς δ' ἂν τι εἰση]γήσ⟨ασ⟩θαι β[ο]ύληται τῶν^{v}
συμφερόντων τοῖς βασιλεῦσι καὶ τοῖς Ἕλλη]σιν ἢ εἰσαγ[γε]ῖλαί τινας ὡς ὑ-^{v}
85 πεναντία πράττοντας τοῖς συμμά[χοις ἢ μ]ὴ πειθομέν[ου]σ̣ι τοῖς δεδογμέ-^{vvv}
νοις, ἢ ἄλλο τι χρηματίσαι τοῖς συ[νέδροις], ἀπογραφέσθω [πρὸ]ς τοὺς προέδρους·
οἱ δὲ προτιθέτωσαν εἰς τοὺς συνέδρους.

83: εἰσηγῆσθαι (for εἰσηγεῖσθαι): Peek. || 84: [ταῖς πόλε]σιν: Kougeas, Roussel. || 85–86: [τοῖς κοινῆι δεδογμέ]|νοις: Kougeas. [ὡμολογημέ]|νοις: Wilhelm. [γεγραμμέ]|νοις: Wilcken, *SPAW* 1922; Roussel. || 86: [εἰ]ς: Kougeas.

III: Schmitt 446 IV

[- - - - - - - - - - - - - ἐὰν δέ τις?]
[πόλ]ις ἢ ἰδιώτης πα[ρα]βαίνηι τι̣νὰ τ[ῶν - - - - - - - - - -]
[γεγρ]α̣μμένων, ζημιούντωσαν οἱ [σύνεδροι - - - - - - - - - -]

108–9: [στρατευό]|μεν]ο̣ς or [στρατι|ώτ]η̣ς: Wilcken. [πόλις ἢ| ἔθν]ο̣ς: Bengtson. [ἐὰν δὲ ἢ| πό]λις: Peek. || For a restoration of line 109, Schmitt suggests the following as an example: τ[ῶν ἐν ταῖς ὁμολογίαις ἢ ἐν τοῖς δόγμασι]. || 109–10: [τῶν| γεγρ]αμμένων: Peek. || 110: οἱ [μὲν πρόεδροι]: Bengtson.

In the spring of 302, when tension between the Antigonids and the other new Hellenistic kingdoms was reaching a crisis, Antigonos and Demetrios decided to exploit the positive feelings towards themselves in Greece. Demetrios with his reputation as a liberator, particularly significant in Athens, was able to construct a more successful coalition of the Greek states than either Polyperchon or Ptolemy before him. This coalition, whose purpose was that of military backing for the Antigonids, took the form of a renewal of the League of Corinth of Philip and Alexander.[1] Nevertheless, despite the primacy of the organization's role as a military alliance for immediate exploitation, the new League was apparently endowed with a full and complete constitution that provided for a permanent existence.[2]

As a renewal of the League of Corinth, the Hellenic League too embodied a common peace, assured by a typical guarantee clause.[3] In all likelihood, as with the League of Corinth, it would be the *synedrion*'s judgement that would determine whether to take up arms. Opportunities for arbitration and legal settlements would therefore be available. The hegemons would naturally always be interested, and any potentially serious infraction might warrant their interference. But in the case of a dispute that could be settled by military *or* legal means, it would be to the advantage of the hegemon to pursue the latter course, and not allow the League to squander its military resources on internal fighting.

That the *synedrion* of the Hellenic League of 302 was vested with various powers of judgement is clear from the regulations that were set out in the

1. See Plut. *Demetr.* 25.3.

2. For conflicting views on the long-term viability of the Hellenic League see J. A. O. Larsen, *Rapport au IXe Congrès international des sciences historiques* I (Paris, 1950) p. 404; Will, vol. 1, p. 79.

3. The oath (Schmitt 446 V, lines 147–51): [ἐὰν δέ| τ]ις ἄλλος τού[των τι πράττηι? - - ὑπεναντίον τι?| ποι]ῶν? τοῖς ἐν [ταῖς συνθήκαις γεγραμμένοις?, οὐκ ἐπιτρέψω εἰς δύ|ναμιν?], ἀλλὰ πολ[εμήσω τῶι - - παραβαίνοντι? - - τὴν| συμμα]χίαν.

League's constitution. The first passage cited above (I, lines 34–37), although heavily restored, appears to imply that legal process will take over if any member state does anything contrary to the treaty. In that case anyone would have the right to bring an indictment against the offender with the *proedroi*, the presiding officers of the council. The *proedroi* or, more probably, the *synedroi* would then sit in judgement on the case and if the offending state was found to be guilty, would sentence it either to pay a fine or to suffer some other form of punishment. The regulation states that whoever wished to do so (ὁ βουλόμενος) could bring the indictment. Such an individual might easily be a representative of the state directly injured by the offending party. In that case, this regulation clearly provides for the arbitration of the *synedrion* between the parties. Similar regulations are reiterated in other portions of the inscription. In the second section cited above, which deals largely with the rights and responsibilities of the *proedroi* and the *synedroi*, it is stated that anyone who wishes may impeach those who are acting contrary to the interests of the allies or who are disobedient to the decisions of the League. Again the impeachment is to be made before the *proedroi*, who are then to submit the matter to the *synedrion*. A more fragmented portion of the inscription (III) appears to provide for penalties against any city or individual transgressing any of the regulations of the treaty.

The *synedrion* of the Hellenic League clearly had general powers of judgement both over individuals and over member states. It seems most likely, judging both from the constitution of the League itself and from comparison with its predecessor, the League of Corinth, that this would include the right and responsibility to arbitrate between member states. However, to assert that the Hellenic League formed by the Antigonids embodied in its constitution potential provisions for arbitration is far from making the claim that such provisions were actually put into effect. The League's existence was so ephemeral that it is quite probable that a call for arbitration was never placed before it.

15. Kos carries out a boundary arbitration between Klazomenai and Teos (c. 302?)

Fragment of a marble stele, inscribed on both sides (A and B), discovered in the Asklepieion on Kos. H: 0.68 m; w: 0.35 m; d: 0.155 m.

G. Pugliese Carratelli, *PP* 33 (1978) pp. 153–56; **SEG* XXVIII.697 (after Pugliese Carratelli).

Billows, pp. 209, 232, 255, 259–60; Ager, *ZPE* 85 (1991) pp. 87–97.

A [- - - - - - - - - - - - - - Καρν]έωι ἐνδεκάτ[αι - - - - -]
[τάδε διεδίκασαν οἱ δικαστ]αὶ οἱ τῶγ Κώιων - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -τος, Θεόφαντος ΛΑ- - - - - -

League's constitution. The first passage cited above (I, lines 34–37), although heavily restored, appears to imply that legal process will take over if any member state does anything contrary to the treaty. In that case anyone would have the right to bring an indictment against the offender with the *proedroi*, the presiding officers of the council. The *proedroi* or, more probably, the *synedroi* would then sit in judgement on the case and if the offending state was found to be guilty, would sentence it either to pay a fine or to suffer some other form of punishment. The regulation states that whoever wished to do so (ὁ βουλόμενος) could bring the indictment. Such an individual might easily be a representative of the state directly injured by the offending party. In that case, this regulation clearly provides for the arbitration of the *synedrion* between the parties. Similar regulations are reiterated in other portions of the inscription. In the second section cited above, which deals largely with the rights and responsibilities of the *proedroi* and the *synedroi*, it is stated that anyone who wishes may impeach those who are acting contrary to the interests of the allies or who are disobedient to the decisions of the League. Again the impeachment is to be made before the *proedroi*, who are then to submit the matter to the *synedrion*. A more fragmented portion of the inscription (III) appears to provide for penalties against any city or individual transgressing any of the regulations of the treaty.

The *synedrion* of the Hellenic League clearly had general powers of judgement both over individuals and over member states. It seems most likely, judging both from the constitution of the League itself and from comparison with its predecessor, the League of Corinth, that this would include the right and responsibility to arbitrate between member states. However, to assert that the Hellenic League formed by the Antigonids embodied in its constitution potential provisions for arbitration is far from making the claim that such provisions were actually put into effect. The League's existence was so ephemeral that it is quite probable that a call for arbitration was never placed before it.

15. Kos carries out a boundary arbitration between Klazomenai and Teos (c. 302?)

Fragment of a marble stele, inscribed on both sides (A and B), discovered in the Asklepieion on Kos. H: 0.68 m; w: 0.35 m; d: 0.155 m.

G. Pugliese Carratelli, *PP* 33 (1978) pp. 153–56; **SEG* XXVIII.697 (after Pugliese Carratelli).

Billows, pp. 209, 232, 255, 259–60; Ager, *ZPE* 85 (1991) pp. 87–97.

A [- - - - - - - - - - - - - - Καρν]έωι ἐνδεκάτ[αι - - - - -]
[τάδε διεδίκασαν οἱ δικαστ]αὶ οἱ τῶγ Κώιων - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -τος, Θεόφαντος ΛΑ- - - - - -

- - - - - - - - - - -ιφάνης Κατύρου, Ξενο- - - - - -
[- - κατὰ τοὺς νόμους] τῶμ πόλεων καὶ κατὰ τὸ διά[γραμμα]
[τὸ Ἀντιγόνου - - -]ικου Θρασυκλεῦς Τηίου καὶ Δημ- - -
- - - - - - μὲ[ν] Ἀρτέμωνος Κλεισίππου, Μεγαθ[ύμου]
[- - - - - Κλα]ζομενίων δὲ Πυθέου τοῦ Ἡροκράτους - - -
- - - - - - - - - . . . ΣΥ . οντος ὑπὲρ τῆς χώρας τῆς ἀμ[φις]-
[βητουμένης - -] . . . Κλαζομενίαν ε[ἶ]ναι, τὰ δὲ ἐν ἀριστ[ε]-
[ρᾶι - - - -] τῶν ὅρων τῆς Κολωφονίας ἀπὸ τοῦ τάφου τοῦ
- - - - - ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ ὁμαλοῦ κατὰ κράναν Ο? ἕως εἰς τ[ὸ]
- - - - - -ΛΕΤΥΝΑ . ΩΝ ἕως ἐς τὸν Ἀρνικέφαλον καὶ
- - - - - -Α . . . Τ . . ΙΑΙ . Σ—ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν πάγων Κατα-
[κρανεῖς - - -ω]ν τῶ[ν] Θε[οδώ]ρου τοῦ Ἀντισθένους Κλαζο-
[μενίου - -εἰς] τὸ ὁμαλὲς τού[τω]ν τῶν λόφων—ἀπὸ δὲ το[ῦ]
- - - - - - - τοῦ ποταμοῦ παρὰ ῥάχιν ἄνω εἰς τὴν ὀφρὺν
- - - - -ΣΙ . ΤΟΛΗΣ διὰ το[ῦ] λαγάρου παρὰ τοὺς τάφους
- - - - - - - - -ΙΑ—ἕως τῆς λατομίας—Βίωνος τοῦ Κα-
- - - - - - . . [ε]ἰς τὸ λάγαρον—ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ λαγάρ[ου]
- - - - - - - - ἐς τὸ χαράκωμα—ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ χαρα-
[κώματος - - - - -]ΟΛΙ—Ἀναξίππου Σίμωνος Τηί-
[ου - - - - - - —ἀ]πὸ δὲ τῶμ πάγων Κατακρανεῖς
- - - - - - - - - -ΝΙΑΙ—ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ πάγου τοῦ Ὑ-
[- - - - - - - - τῶν ἀμπέ]λων τῶν Ἀπολλωνίου—
[- - - - - - - - - —ἀ]πὸ δὲ τοῦ ποταμοῦ Τορρυ-
[- - - - - - - - - - τὴ]ν ὁδὸν ὡς ὁ δρῦς ὁ ξηρός
- - - - - - - - -ούσης κάτω παρὰ τὰ αὐ-
- - - - - - - - - ποταμόν—κατὰ ἱερ . -
- - - - - - - - -ΑΣΥΣΑΝΑΦ- - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - -ΥΚΟΠΑΓΟ- - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - - - -ΕΝΩ- - - - - - -

B - - - - - - -ΑΔΗ- - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - εἰς τὴν Ι- - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - ἀπὸ δὲ τ- - - - - - - -
[- - - - - - - ε]ἰς τοὺς κρ- - - - - - -

vacat

- - - - - - - - - -ΙΙ- - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - -ΩΤΟ- - - - - - - -
[- - - - - - ἀπὸ δ]ὲ τῆς Γ- - - - - - -
[- - - - - - - - ε]ἰς Γωνίας - - - - - -
- - - - - - -απετος κατ[ὰ - - - - - -]
[- - - - - τ]ὴν ἐπ' Ἐρυθρ[αι - - - - - -]
- - - -ος ἀπὸ τῆς . - - - - - - - - - -
- - - -ν ἄνω - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - -ΟΙ- - - - - - - - - - - - -

This inscription contains the Koan record of a boundary dispute on the mainland, a dispute settled by Koan judges.[1] The judges' decision was given in accordance with the laws of the cities (in dispute), and perhaps with a διάγραμμα of Antigonos Monophthalmos.[2] A list of names is included with this document; the rest of the inscription is concerned with the delimitation of the boundaries of the disputed territory. The "borders of Kolophon" are mentioned (A, line 11), as is some landmark in the direction of Erythrai (B, line 9). The original editor of this inscription believed it to refer to a dispute between Klazomenai, who was awarded the disputed land (A, line 10), and perhaps Kolophon. The geographic relationship of the various cities in the region, however, suggest Teos as a much more likely candidate for Klazomenai's rival here. In addition, private individuals from Teos are mentioned twice in this inscription. In the first place (A, line 6), they seem to form part of a list, perhaps of representatives from Teos to Antigonos, or to Kos. The Klazomenian(s) mentioned in the following line would be performing the same service for their country. In the second place, the property of an individual Teian is mentioned as part of the boundary settlement (A, line 22).[3]

If "κατὰ τὸ διά-" really is sufficient grounds for understanding a reference to an edict of Antigonos here, then it is likely that he would have set down some general rules according to which the Koan judges could make their decision, and then passed the task on to them. If this settlement between Klazomenai and Teos took place late in Antigonos's reign, just before 301, perhaps it was connected to the synoikism of Teos and Lebedos (**13**). It may be that the proposed shifting of populations (the Lebedians were to move to Teos) would have inspired the Teians to try to expand their territory.

16. The Boiotian League settles the borders of Koroneia and Lebadeia (fourth or third century?)

A round limestone column discovered at Granitza in Boiotia; the inscription runs along the length of the pillar, which is broken at the top. H: 1.0 m; diam. (base): 0.39 m, (top): 0.33 m.

1. These judges are probably named in A, lines 3–4.

2. Cf. **13**. Pugliese Carratelli compares *OGIS* 7 (from Kymai), lines 1–2: τὸ δικαστήριον παργενόμε[νον]| ἐγ Μαγνησίας κατὰ τὸ διάγραμμα τὸ Ἀντιγόνω. The restoration of Antigonos's name here is clearly open to question.

3. See Ager, *ZPE* 85, for a full discussion of this arbitration and its place in the pattern of events in this region at the end of the fourth century.

This inscription contains the Koan record of a boundary dispute on the mainland, a dispute settled by Koan judges.[1] The judges' decision was given in accordance with the laws of the cities (in dispute), and perhaps with a διάγραμμα of Antigonos Monophthalmos.[2] A list of names is included with this document; the rest of the inscription is concerned with the delimitation of the boundaries of the disputed territory. The "borders of Kolophon" are mentioned (A, line 11), as is some landmark in the direction of Erythrai (B, line 9). The original editor of this inscription believed it to refer to a dispute between Klazomenai, who was awarded the disputed land (A, line 10), and perhaps Kolophon. The geographic relationship of the various cities in the region, however, suggest Teos as a much more likely candidate for Klazomenai's rival here. In addition, private individuals from Teos are mentioned twice in this inscription. In the first place (A, line 6), they seem to form part of a list, perhaps of representatives from Teos to Antigonos, or to Kos. The Klazomenian(s) mentioned in the following line would be performing the same service for their country. In the second place, the property of an individual Teian is mentioned as part of the boundary settlement (A, line 22).[3]

If "κατὰ τὸ διά-" really is sufficient grounds for understanding a reference to an edict of Antigonos here, then it is likely that he would have set down some general rules according to which the Koan judges could make their decision, and then passed the task on to them. If this settlement between Klazomenai and Teos took place late in Antigonos's reign, just before 301, perhaps it was connected to the synoikism of Teos and Lebedos (**13**). It may be that the proposed shifting of populations (the Lebedians were to move to Teos) would have inspired the Teians to try to expand their territory.

16. The Boiotian League settles the borders of Koroneia and Lebadeia (fourth or third century?)

A round limestone column discovered at Granitza in Boiotia; the inscription runs along the length of the pillar, which is broken at the top. H: 1.0 m; diam. (base): 0.39 m, (top): 0.33 m.

1. These judges are probably named in A, lines 3–4.

2. Cf. **13**. Pugliese Carratelli compares *OGIS* 7 (from Kymai), lines 1–2: τὸ δικαστήριον παργενόμε[νον]| ἐγ Μαγνησίας κατὰ τὸ διάγραμμα τὸ Ἀντιγόνω. The restoration of Antigonos's name here is clearly open to question.

3. See Ager, *ZPE* 85, for a full discussion of this arbitration and its place in the pattern of events in this region at the end of the fourth century.

W. Vollgraff, *BCH* 26 (1902) p. 570; Wilhelm, *Neue Beiträge* 1, pp. 13–19, no. 3; *P. Roesch, *Thespies et la confédération béotienne* (Paris, 1965) pp. 61–63; *SEG* XXIII.297 (after Roesch).

Tod 21; E. Preuner, *Hermes* 55 (1920) pp. 394–95.

[Ὅρια τᾶς Τροφ]ωνιάδος γᾶς
[ἰαρᾶς κὴ Λεβα]δειήωμ ποτὶ
[Κορωνείας ὡς] Βοιωτοὶ ὥριτταγ
[κὰτ τὰν ὁδὸν τὰ]ν ἐς τᾶμ παγάων
[ἄγωσαν ἔττε] ὡς τὰ ἄκρα ὡς ὕ-
[δωρ ῥέει? ἐπὶ τ]ὸμ βωμὸν τῶ Δι-
[ὸς τῶ Λαφουστί]ω.

1: [Τροφ]ωνιάδος γᾶς: Preuner. || 1–2: [Ἑλικ]ωνιάδος γᾶς| [πόλι Λεβα]δειήωμ: Wilhelm. || 4: [κὰτ τὰν ὁδὸν τὰ]ν: Roesch. || 5: [ἄγωσαν ἔττε]: Roesch. || 7: [τῶ Ἑλικωνί]ω or [Λαφυστί]ω: Wilhelm.

The words Βοιωτοὶ ὥριτταγ identify this inscription as a boundary demarcation.[1] The stone itself, a round pillar, was well suited to act as the actual ὅρος. It was found at Granitza, approximately 4 kilometers southeast of Lebadeia, in the direction of Koroneia;[2] it seems reasonable to assume that Koroneia was the second party to the dispute.[3] Koroneia and Lebadeia were both members of the Boiotian League, and here, as in **17**, the federal *koinon* probably arbitrated a dispute between two of its members. There is no mention of the delegation of this arbitration to a third city, as often happened in the Achaian League. It can be inferred that the Boiotian League at least occasionally settled disputes between its members directly.[4]

The second part of the inscription (lines 4–7) deals with the actual delineation of the boundaries. The disputed land (the Helikonian territory of Wilhelm, and the Trophonian territory of Roesch) lay to the southeast of Lebadeia and to the west of Koroneia.[5] The area in question contained an important sanctuary of Zeus. Proprietorship of this sanctuary may well have been the initial source of the dispute, as the land itself is mountainous and arid, and of little intrinsic worth.[6]

1. Wilhelm (p. 13), who compared the inscriptions *IG* VII.2792 (**17**) and *IG* IX^2 1.3B (**41**).
2. See Roesch p. 61.
3. Wilhelm, p. 14.
4. See **16** and **17**, the only evidence we have for federal arbitration within the Boiotian League. Neither inscription contains detail about the formalities of the arbitrations; it would be rash to assert that the Boiotian League invariably intervened directly.
5. Wilhelm, pp. 16–17; Roesch, p. 61.
6. Roesch, pp. 62–63.

17. The Boiotian League settles the borders of Akraipheia and Kopai (third century)

An inscription on a huge block of stone, probably broken away from the cliff near the road from Karditza to Topolia in Boiotia. H (of rock): 4.0 m; w (of inscribed face): 3.90 m; average height of letters: 0.10 m.

P. Jamot, *BCH* 13 (1889) pp. 407–8; *Dittenberger, *IG* VII.2792; id., *SIG*^{2} 454; F. Bleckmann, *Griechische Inschriften zur griechischen Staatenkunde* (Bonn, 1913) 1b; Dittenberger/Hiller von Gaertringen, *SIG*^{3} 933; Daverio Rocchi, pp. 120–22, no. 9.

P. Perdrizet, *BCH* 24 (1900) pp. 70–81; Wilhelm, *Neue Beiträge* 1, p. 13; Raeder 39; Tod 17; P. Roesch, *Thespies et la confédération béotienne* (Paris, 1965) p. 64.

Ὅρια K[ω]πήων
ποτ' Ἀκρηιφεῖα[ς]
ὁριττ[ά]ντων Βοιω[τῶν].

3: ὁριττ[ό]ντων: Jamot. ὁριττ[ά]ντων: Dittenberger, Hiller von Gaertringen.

This text, like **16**, deals with a boundary dispute between two members of the Boiotian League, a dispute that was settled under the auspices of the League. In this instance, it was the two communities of Kopai and Akraipheia who laid claim to territory on the eastern shores of Lake Kopais. Roesch suggested that here the conflict had economic roots: the disagreement concerned the good pasturage available by the shores of the lake, and perhaps access to the fishing of the famous eels of Lake Kopais.[1]

Perhaps here, as in the previous case concerning Lebadeia and Koroneia, the dispute was settled by a court of League representatives from the various cities. Raeder believed this settlement was adjudicated by a regular federal tribunal, made up of League representatives drawn in the same numerical ratio as the Boiotarchs; Dittenberger thought that the court responsible for decisions such as this actually was the regular federal council of the League.[2] Our evidence for either speculation is far too limited; we can conjecture, however, that it would have been necessary to delegate a small group of judges who would visit the site in order to determine the exact boundaries.[3]

1. Roesch, p. 64. Perhaps the dispute was one in a long series: cf. the boundary stone of the sixth or fifth century B.C., probably between Kopai and Akraipheia (*SEG* XXX.440).

2. Raeder, pp. 78–79; *SIG*^{2} 454.

3. Cf. **38**, where the judges who made the primary decision are clearly distinguished from those who physically went over the disputed territory.

18. An arbitration between Boura and an unknown state (third century)

Two noncontiguous pieces of a bronze plate, purchased by Froehner at Thebes in 1895. Left fragment: h: 0.075 m; w: 0.117 m. Right fragment: h: 0.14 m; w: 0.10 m.

L. Robert, *Collection Froehner* I (Paris, 1936) pp. 46–50, no. 41 (majuscule text); *A. G. Woodhead, *SEG* XI.1122.

Flacelière/Robert, *REG* 1938, 133; L. Dubois, *Recherches sur le dialecte arcadien* II (Louvain, 1988) p. 223.

To[ῖ] Βο̣ύριοι? νίκ̣α̣[σαν - - - - - -]α̣νευτοι ἱερ-
ὸν καὶ τὰν ἐπὶ Ε[- - - - - - - - - Π]ρητείαν ἀπὸ
τᾶς Πρητείας α- - - - - - - - -Λ̣ΑΝΤ̣Ι̣ ἐπὶ ΓΡωνε-
ατα ἐπὶ Εὐρυαλ- - - - - - - - - -γεος δέραν ἐπὶ
5 στῦλον ἐμ Πρῳ- - - - - - - - -κειον καθ' ὕδατ-
ος ῥοάς. Δι[κ]α̣[σταὶ - - - - - - -]ο̣ς, Ἀλεξιμέν-
η̣ς, - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -ης, Ἀριστόδα-
μ[ος, - - - - - - - - - - - -]ρ̣ιαμίδας?, Ἀ-
ναγ̣[όρας?, - - - - - - - - - - - -]ων, Διοφάνη-
10 ς, Λ̣Γ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -ος, Ἀνδροκλ-
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - \ιος, Ἀγαθ . . .
[- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -α]νδρ̣ος, ΣΛ . .
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -η̣ς, Πυ . . . .
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -ης, Διοφ[α- - -,]
15 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -Ε- - - - - - -

This extremely fragmented inscription appears to consist of the notice of a judgement, a delimitation of borders, and a list of judges. Although they offer very little specific information, the fragments of this document definitely point to a boundary dispute and arbitration. The provenance of the inscription was purportedly Boiotian Thebes; however, the inscription does not seem to be Boiotian, and Robert was suspicious of the supposed venue. Boiotian inscriptions were generally engraved on stone, not bronze; the latter material was most commonly used for inscriptions in Elis and Arkadia, although it appears also in Thessaly and in western and central Greece.[1] The appearance of the name "Bourioi" in line 1 also indicates that the Peloponnese is the correct provenance for this inscription, since it probably refers to Boura in Arkadia. The inscription may originally have been published at Boura itself, or perhaps at an important

1. Robert, pp. 47–48.

sanctuary.[2] Apparently Boura won the contest; it is possible that the name of the defeated party was given somewhere in the lacuna. Clearly the dispute was over a piece of territory, since lines 1–6 describe in fairly typical fashion a demarcation of boundaries.[3] The provenance of the judges has also been lost. The number of judges appears to have been rather large, though with no indication of the size of the lacuna, recovering the exact number is impossible.

19. Eretria arbitrates between Naxos and another state (?) (third century?)

The left side of a broken marble stele, discovered in the temple of Apollo at Eretria. H: 0.28 m; w: 0.25 m; d: 0.10 m.

K. Kourouniotes, *AE* 1911, p. 34, no. 23; *Ziebarth, *IG* XII.9.223; Schmitt 574.

H. F. Hitzig, *ZRG* 28 (1907) p. 246; A. Wilhelm, *AE* 1912, p. 250; Tod 46; *IG* XII supp., p. 105; Robert, *REG* 1961, 488.

[. . . ὅταν ὁμο]-
λογηθῆι - - - - - - - - - -
τῆι βουλῆι Μ- - - - - - - -
Κεφάλου Κλε[- - - ἐν μὲν Νάξωι]
αἰcυ[μ]νώντων Cω[- - - - - μη]-
νὸc Ἀπατουριῶνος, [ἐν δὲ . . . . ἄρχοντος]
[Ἀλκ]εδάμαντος - - - - - - - - -
[cύ]νδικοι Ναξίων οἱ ὁμολογ[ήcαντες - - -]
δημοcίαι παρόντες·
Ἀγαθίων Εὐήνορος
Ἀριστόδημος Ἀριστοκλ[έους]
Ἀρχεμαχίδης Καλλικ- - - - -
Ἡγέστρατος Ἡγες- - - - - - -
[C]ώπολις Cίμο ᵛ
[Δ]ημομένης Μνης- - - - - -
- -ο- - - - -

1: [ὅταν]: Ziebarth. || 4-5: [ἐν μὲν Νάξωι]| αἰcυμνώντων: Wilhelm, Ziebarth. [ἐμ μὲν Νάξωι]: Schmitt. || 5: \Ιευ . νώντων: Kourouniotes. || 6: [ἐν δὲ - - e.g. ἄρχοντος]: Wilhelm, Ziebarth. || 8: [ἐ]νδίκοιν ἀξιῶν οἱ ὁμολογ[εῖν]:

2. Robert (p. 49) conjectures that the inscription was published at the sanctuary of Artemis at Lousoi in northern Arkadia. Dubois believes that Lousoi may have been Boura's opponent in the case.

3. Cf. **1**, **16**, **38**.

sanctuary.[2] Apparently Boura won the contest; it is possible that the name of the defeated party was given somewhere in the lacuna. Clearly the dispute was over a piece of territory, since lines 1–6 describe in fairly typical fashion a demarcation of boundaries.[3] The provenance of the judges has also been lost. The number of judges appears to have been rather large, though with no indication of the size of the lacuna, recovering the exact number is impossible.

19. Eretria arbitrates between Naxos and another state (?) (third century?)

The left side of a broken marble stele, discovered in the temple of Apollo at Eretria. H: 0.28 m; w: 0.25 m; d: 0.10 m.

K. Kourouniotes, *AE* 1911, p. 34, no. 23; *Ziebarth, *IG* XII.9.223; Schmitt 574.

H. F. Hitzig, *ZRG* 28 (1907) p. 246; A. Wilhelm, *AE* 1912, p. 250; Tod 46; *IG* XII supp., p. 105; Robert, *REG* 1961, 488.

[. . . ὅταν ὁμο]-
λογηθῆι - - - - - - - - - -
τῆι βουλῆι Μ- - - - - - - -
Κεφάλου Κλε[- - - ἐν μὲν Νάξωι]
αἰcυ[μ]νώντων Cω[- - - - - μη]-
νὸc Ἀπατουριῶνος, [ἐν δὲ . . . . ἄρχοντος]
[Ἀλκ]εδάμαντος - - - - - - - - -
[cύ]νδικοι Ναξίων οἱ ὁμολογ[ήcαντες - - -]
δημοcίαι παρόντες·
Ἀγαθίων Εὐήνορος
Ἀριστόδημος Ἀριστοκλ[έους]
Ἀρχεμαχίδης Καλλικ- - - - -
Ἡγέστρατος Ἡγες- - - - - - -
[C]ώπολις Cίμο ᵛ
[Δ]ημομένης Μνης- - - - - -
- -ο- - - - -

1: [ὅταν]: Ziebarth. || 4-5: [ἐν μὲν Νάξωι]| αἰcυμνώντων: Wilhelm, Ziebarth. [ἐμ μὲν Νάξωι]: Schmitt. || 5: \Ιευ . νώντων: Kourouniotes. || 6: [ἐν δὲ - - e.g. ἄρχοντος]: Wilhelm, Ziebarth. || 8: [ἐ]νδίκοιν ἀξιῶν οἱ ὁμολογ[εῖν]:

2. Robert (p. 49) conjectures that the inscription was published at the sanctuary of Artemis at Lousoi in northern Arkadia. Dubois believes that Lousoi may have been Boura's opponent in the case.

3. Cf. **1**, **16**, **38**.

Kourouniotes. [cύ]νδικοι Ναξίων οἱ ὁμόλογ[οι]: Wilhelm. [cύν]δικοι Ναξίων οἱ ὁμολογ[ήcαντεc]: Ziebarth.

Little is left of this inscription, but some of the terms that appear in it suggest that it deals with an arbitration.[1] It clearly deals with some kind of interstate agreement; since the stone was unearthed at Eretria, and since it mentions Naxian officials at line 8, the natural assumption is that two of the states involved were Eretria and Naxos. What we have here may be the end of the document, giving little beyond the fact that some kind of agreement was reached, and then providing the eponymous dating and the list of various representatives present at the agreement. The text refers to certain Naxian cύνδικοι, apparently public advocates: if δημοcίαι παρόντεc refers to them, then they were certainly present in a public capacity.[2] The role of these cύνδικοι would have been to represent Naxos's claims in whatever adjudication was taking place.[3]

It is possible that here as well as in **83** Naxos was one of the litigant states, and Eretria, acting as an ἔκκλητοc πόλιc, furnished an arbitral court. But there is no positive evidence to connect this case to **83**, as Tod did. The latter case dates from a later period, and there is no evidence of Paros being involved in the present case. Nevertheless it is not impossible that the two cases arose from similar disputes, or even the same one, which perhaps required settling numerous times.[4]

20. Elis arbitrates the borders of Phanoteus and Stiris (third century)

A limestone block bearing two inscriptions, discovered near Chaironeia. H (of stone): 0.565 m; w: 0.82 m; d: 0.655 m. H (of inscription): 0.30 m; w: 0.74 m.

*D. Rousset and Ph. Katzouros, *BCH* 116 (1992) pp. 197-215.

G. Klaffenbach, *Glotta* 48 (1970) pp. 204-5; Robert, *REG* 1971, 180.

Τάδε ἔκριναν οἱ γαοδίκαι οἱ ἀποcταλέν-
τεc ἀπὸ τᾶc πόλιοc τῶν Ἀλείων
Φανοτέοιc Cτειρίοιc περὶ τᾶc χώρας

1. Tod believed that this inscription was related to the second-century arbitration of Eretria between Naxos and Paros (**83**). But the inscription from the present case is to be dated to the third century; see Wilhelm, p. 251.

2. On the other hand, the phrase may simply refer to public magistrates involved in whatever agreement took place (so Ziebarth). Ziebarth believes this to have been a financial agreement between Eretria and Naxos.

3. For cύνδικοι as advocates representing their state in an arbitration, cf. **137**.

4. Cf. the Samos and Priene dispute or Sparta's disputes with its neighbours.

Kourouniotes. [cύ]νδικοι Ναξίων οἱ ὁμόλογ[οι]: Wilhelm. [cύν]δικοι Ναξίων οἱ ὁμολογ[ήcαντεc]: Ziebarth.

Little is left of this inscription, but some of the terms that appear in it suggest that it deals with an arbitration.[1] It clearly deals with some kind of interstate agreement; since the stone was unearthed at Eretria, and since it mentions Naxian officials at line 8, the natural assumption is that two of the states involved were Eretria and Naxos. What we have here may be the end of the document, giving little beyond the fact that some kind of agreement was reached, and then providing the eponymous dating and the list of various representatives present at the agreement. The text refers to certain Naxian cύνδικοι, apparently public advocates: if δημοcίαι παρόντεc refers to them, then they were certainly present in a public capacity.[2] The role of these cύνδικοι would have been to represent Naxos's claims in whatever adjudication was taking place.[3]

It is possible that here as well as in **83** Naxos was one of the litigant states, and Eretria, acting as an ἔκκλητοc πόλιc, furnished an arbitral court. But there is no positive evidence to connect this case to **83**, as Tod did. The latter case dates from a later period, and there is no evidence of Paros being involved in the present case. Nevertheless it is not impossible that the two cases arose from similar disputes, or even the same one, which perhaps required settling numerous times.[4]

20. Elis arbitrates the borders of Phanoteus and Stiris (third century)

A limestone block bearing two inscriptions, discovered near Chaironeia. H (of stone): 0.565 m; w: 0.82 m; d: 0.655 m. H (of inscription): 0.30 m; w: 0.74 m.

*D. Rousset and Ph. Katzouros, *BCH* 116 (1992) pp. 197-215.

G. Klaffenbach, *Glotta* 48 (1970) pp. 204-5; Robert, *REG* 1971, 180.

Τάδε ἔκριναν οἱ γαοδίκαι οἱ ἀποcταλέν-
τεc ἀπὸ τᾶc πόλιοc τῶν Ἀλείων
Φανοτέοιc Cτειρίοιc περὶ τᾶc χώρας

1. Tod believed that this inscription was related to the second-century arbitration of Eretria between Naxos and Paros (**83**). But the inscription from the present case is to be dated to the third century; see Wilhelm, p. 251.

2. On the other hand, the phrase may simply refer to public magistrates involved in whatever agreement took place (so Ziebarth). Ziebarth believes this to have been a financial agreement between Eretria and Naxos.

3. For cύνδικοι as advocates representing their state in an arbitration, cf. **137**.

4. Cf. the Samos and Priene dispute or Sparta's disputes with its neighbours.

ἃς ἀντέλεγον· Φανοτέων εἶναι κατὰ τὰ ὅ-
ρια τάδε· τὸν Φωκιῶνα· ἐκ τοῦ Φωκιῶνος ἐν vac. 2
τὸν Καλυδῶνα· ἐκ τοῦ Καλυδῶνος ἐν τὰν διόδιον·
ἐκ τᾶς διοδίου ἐπὶ τὸν Πέτραχον τὸν ποτὶ μέ̣σον ἀμέ-
ρας τοῦ λάκκου· ἐκ τοῦ Πετράχου ἐπὶ τὰν κολουάδα
τὰν εὐδείελον· ἐκ τᾶς κολουάδος ἐπὶ τὰν ϲκοπι̣[ὰν]
[τ]ὰ̣ν ποτὶ μέσον ἀμέρα̣ς τᾶς - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

From the remnants of the letters remaining at the end of line 10, J. Bousquet (in *BCH* 116 [1992] p. 200) conjectured τᾶς χ̣λ̣ονώ̣δε̣ο̣[ϲ πέτρας?].

This stone was discovered in 1925 by E. Gose and F. Schober, but the two inscriptions it bears have only recently been published. Both appear from their letterforms to have been inscribed in the third century. The block, which had originally been employed as a statue base and bore the name of the individual represented, was reused subsequently for the inscription of the boundary demarcation. The arbitration, then, may have occurred somewhat later in the third century.

The inscription is typical of boundary judgements. It records the decision of certain Eleians sent to arbitrate between Phanoteus and Stiris over a contested piece of land that lay between them. The editors point out one of the more unusual aspects of this conflict, that Phanoteus and Stiris were not only relatively distant from each other but were also separated by mountainous terrain. One would have to conjecture some other reason for the territorial rivalry between them than the chronic one of agricultural land hunger. Perhaps there was some military or religious significance to the disputed land.[1]

The men from Elis, who awarded the territory to Phanoteus, are not called simply "judges" (δικαταί or κριταί) within the extant portion of the inscription. The term employed instead, γαοδίκαι, is one encountered in only one other boundary arbitration, that between Matropolis and Oiniadai in Akarnania (**41**). The word is unusual, though its meaning is clear enough. No doubt it is employed here simply to describe the actual function of these men: to make a judicial decision, and to implement it by delineating the border.

21. Knidos arbitrates a loan dispute between Kalymna and Kos (c. 300–286)

An inscription discovered at the temple of Apollo at Kalymna. The document is inscribed on two sides of a stele, broken at the top (A ii and B). A fragment that

1. Cf. the territorial disputes in **16**, **26**, **32**.

ἃς ἀντέλεγον· Φανοτέων εἶναι κατὰ τὰ ὅ-
ρια τάδε· τὸν Φωκιῶνα· ἐκ τοῦ Φωκιῶνος ἐν vac. 2
τὸν Καλυδῶνα· ἐκ τοῦ Καλυδῶνος ἐν τὰν διόδιον·
ἐκ τᾶς διοδίου ἐπὶ τὸν Πέτραχον τὸν ποτὶ μέ̣σον ἀμέ-
ρας τοῦ λάκκου· ἐκ τοῦ Πετράχου ἐπὶ τὰν κολουάδα
τὰν εὐδείελον· ἐκ τᾶς κολουάδος ἐπὶ τὰν ϲκοπι̣[ὰν]
[τ]ὰ̣ν ποτὶ μέσον ἀμέρα̣ς τᾶς - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

From the remnants of the letters remaining at the end of line 10, J. Bousquet (in *BCH* 116 [1992] p. 200) conjectured τᾶς χ̣λ̣ονώ̣δε̣ο̣[ϲ πέτρας?].

This stone was discovered in 1925 by E. Gose and F. Schober, but the two inscriptions it bears have only recently been published. Both appear from their letterforms to have been inscribed in the third century. The block, which had originally been employed as a statue base and bore the name of the individual represented, was reused subsequently for the inscription of the boundary demarcation. The arbitration, then, may have occurred somewhat later in the third century.

The inscription is typical of boundary judgements. It records the decision of certain Eleians sent to arbitrate between Phanoteus and Stiris over a contested piece of land that lay between them. The editors point out one of the more unusual aspects of this conflict, that Phanoteus and Stiris were not only relatively distant from each other but were also separated by mountainous terrain. One would have to conjecture some other reason for the territorial rivalry between them than the chronic one of agricultural land hunger. Perhaps there was some military or religious significance to the disputed land.[1]

The men from Elis, who awarded the territory to Phanoteus, are not called simply "judges" (δικαταί or κριταί) within the extant portion of the inscription. The term employed instead, γαοδίκαι, is one encountered in only one other boundary arbitration, that between Matropolis and Oiniadai in Akarnania (**41**). The word is unusual, though its meaning is clear enough. No doubt it is employed here simply to describe the actual function of these men: to make a judicial decision, and to implement it by delineating the border.

21. Knidos arbitrates a loan dispute between Kalymna and Kos (c. 300–286)

An inscription discovered at the temple of Apollo at Kalymna. The document is inscribed on two sides of a stele, broken at the top (A ii and B). A fragment that

1. Cf. the territorial disputes in **16**, **26**, **32**.

appears to preserve the opening lines of the document (A i) was discovered built into a church wall located not far from the temple of Apollo.

A i: h: 0.69 m; w: 0.23 m; d: 0.14 m.

Berard 41; Müllensiefen, *SGDI* 3592; R. Herzog, *RFIC* 20 (1942) pp. 1–5, no. 1; *M. Segre, "Tituli Calymnii," *Annuario della Scuola archeologica di Atene* 22–23 (1944–45) no. 79, pp. 97–121.

A ii and B: h: 1.05 m; w: 0.48 m; d: 0.18 m.

Newton, *BMus* 299; R. Dareste, *BCH* 10 (1886) pp. 235–44; Dareste/Haussoullier/Reinach, *RJG* I.10; Berard 41; Müllensiefen, *SGDI* 3591; Michel 1340; Dittenberger, *SIG*^{2} 512; Dittenberger/Hiller von Gaertringen, *SIG*^{3} 953; Schwyzer 263; *M. Segre, "Tituli Calymnii," *Annuario della Scuola archeologica di Atene* 22–23 (1944–45) no. 79, pp. 97–121; R. Bogaert: Pleket, *Epigraphica* III (Leiden, 1976) 42 (B); L. Migeotte, *L'emprunt public dans les cités grecques* (Quebec and Paris, 1984) 59 (B, lines 3–38).

Sonne 60, 61; Hitzig, p. 56; Phillipson, pp. 148–49; Raeder 79; Tod 75, 76; A. Wilhelm, *AAWW* 18 (1924) pp. 19–25; M. Segre, *Epigraphica* I (1938) pp. 9–16; Flacelière/Robert, *REG* 1939, 270–71; id., *REG* 1948, 185; R. Bogaert, *Banques et banquiers dans les cités grecques* (Leiden, 1968) pp. 208–10; Robert, *REG* 1969, 78; S. M. Sherwin-White, *Ancient Cos* (Göttingen, 1978) p. 72; Thür, pp. 473–74.

A i [Ἔδοξε τᾶι βουλᾶι καὶ τῶι δάμωι, γνώμα στρ]ατ̣αγῶν Λευντιάδα το-
[ῦ δεῖνος, τοῦ δεῖνος - - - - - - - - - -] . . λ̣ωνος, Πειθαράτου το-
[ῦ δεῖνος, τοῦ δεῖνος - - - - - - - - - -] τ̣οῦ Ἀκροτέλευς, Ἐρασικλ-
[εῦς τοῦ δεῖνος, τοῦ δεῖνος τοῦ δεῖνος π]ερὶ τᾶς δίκας ἃς ἐδικάζε-
[το τὰ παιδία τὰ Διαγόρα τοῦ Παυσιμάχ]ο̣υ μετὰ ἐπιτρόπων Φιλί-
[νου τοῦ Διοκλεῦς, Ἀριστοδάμου, Ἀγλάου,] Τ̣ειςία̣, Ἀριστέως τᾶι πό-
[λι τᾶι Καλυμνίων· ἐπεὶ τῶι δάμωι γραφ]ὰ̣ν ἔθεντο τὰ Δια⟨γ⟩όρα παι-
[δία καὶ τοὶ ἐπίτροποι Φιλῖνος Διοκλεῦς,] Ἀ̣ρ̣ι̣ςτόδαμος, Ἄγλαος, Τ-
[ειςίας, Ἀριστεύς, νῦν δὲ καὶ ἁ πόλις ἁ Κα]λ̣υμνίων τοὺς προδίκου-
[ς ἀπέστειλε κομίζοντας ἀντιγραφὰ]ν̣ Ἀρατι̣δ̣[α]ν, [Ἐ]π̣[ίγ]ο̣ν̣[ον?] . . . .
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -ς̣θένη, Θηβάδ[αν κατὰ τὸ]
[παρὰ βασιλέως Δαματρίου ποτίταγμα] τὸ̣ Κ̣α̣λυμνίω̣ν̣ [τε κ]α̣[ὶ Κώι]-
[ων δάμοις ἀποσταλὲν καὶ τοὺς κοινοὺς λό]γ̣ου̣ς̣ τοὺς γεν̣[ομένου]-
[ς ἑκατέροις, δεδόχθαι· προλέγειν] τ̣ο̣ὺ̣ς̣ στρατα̣γ̣[οὺς τᾶς δίκας]
[ἁμέραν τοῖς τε Διαγόρα παισὶ καὶ τᾶι πό]λ̣ι τᾶι Καλυμνίων. ᵛ
[ἐπεὶ δὲ ἑκάτεροι τὰ γράμματα κεχρημα]τ̣[ι]ς̣μένοι ἐντί, λαβόντ[ω]
[τοὶ στραταγοὶ τοὶ ἐν ἀρχᾶι παρὰ τῶν] Δι̣α̣γόρα παιδίων καὶ τῶν ἐ-
[πιτρόπων ἀντίγραφα τοῦ ἐγκλήματο]ς̣ ὅ κ̣α̣ ἐ̣νκαλῆι τὰ Δια⟨γ⟩όρα π-
[αιδία περὶ τοῦ Παυσιμάχου χρέως πρὸ] ἁ̣μερᾶ̣ν πέντε· εἰ δέ κα μ-
[ὴ ἀποδῶντι τὸ ἔγκλημα τοῖς στραταγοῖ]ς̣ κ̣α̣τὰ τὰ γεγραμμένα, μὴ
[εἰσαγόντω τὰν δίκαν τοὶ στραταγοί· λαβόν]τω δὲ καὶ ἀντίγραφα τᾶ[ς]
[ἀντιγραφᾶς τᾶς δεδομένας τοῖς Καλυμ]νίων προδίκοις πρὸ ἁμερ-

[ἄν πέντε· εἰ δέ κα μὴ δῶντι Καλύμνιοι, ν]ικᾶν τὰ Διαγόρα παιδία κρι[ν]-
ii [όντ]ω, ο̣ὐδὲ τὸ ἐπικαλεύμ[ενον ἔχειν τινὰ] τῶν γεγραμμένων ο{ικαγ [γενέσθαι τοὺ]}-
[ὕτ]ε ἔλαccον τούτου. ἐξορκῶν̣[τω δὲ πρὸ το]ῦ δικαστηρίου πρὶν τὰν [δ]⟨ίκαγ γενέσθαι τοὺ⟩)-
c δικαστὰc τοὺc δικάζοντας, ἱ[ερῶν καιομέ]ν̣ων· ὁ δ̣ὲ ὅρκος ἔcτ̣ω ὅδ̣-
ε· ναὶ τὸν Δία καὶ τὸν Ἀπόλλω τὸν Λύκι̣[ον καὶ τὰν Γᾶν δικαccέω περὶ]
ὧν τοὶ ἀντίδικοι ἀντώμοcαν κατὰ γ̣ν̣[ώμαν τὰν οὖcαν δικαιοτάτα]-
ν, καὶ οὐ δικαccέω κατὰ μάρτυρα εἴ κα μὴ [δοκῆι ἀλαθέα μαρτ]-
υρεῖν, οὐδὲ δῶρα ἔλαβον τᾶc δίκαc ταύτας ἔ[νεκεν παρ' οὐδενὸc]
[ο]ὔτε αὐτὸc ἐγὼ οὔτε ἀλ⟨λ⟩οc οὔτε ἄλλα ἐμὶν̣ [τέχναι ἢ μαχανᾶι οὐδ]-
εμιᾶι· εὐορκεῦντι μέμ μοι εὖ εἶμεν, ἐπιορκεῦντ̣[ι δὲ τὰ ἐναντία.]
τὰ δὲ ψαφίcματα καὶ τὰc προκλήcιc καὶ εἴ τί κα ἄλλο δέ̣[ον ἐγ δα]-
μοcίου φέρηται, τιθέcθων ἐπὶ τὸ δικαcτήριον τοὶ ἀν̣[τίδικοι ἐκ]-
άτεροι ἐcφραγιcμένα τᾶι δαμοcίαι cφραγίδι πόλιοc ἑκα[τέραc]
καθά κα ἑκατέρα ἃ πόλιc ψαφίξηται, καὶ παραδότω τοῖc cτρατ-
αγοῖc, τοὶ δὲ cτραταγοὶ λύcαντεc ἐγδιδόντω ἐc τὸ δικαcτήριο-
ν πάντα τὰ γράμματα ἀμφοτέροιc τοῖc ἀντ̣ιδίκοιc. τιθέcθων δὲ κα[ὶ]
τὰc μαρτυρίαc ἑκάτεροι πρὶν οὗ λέγεcθαι τὰν δίκαν. λεγέcθω δὲ
τᾶc δίκαc ὁ μὲν πρᾶτοc λόγοc ἑκατέροιc ποτὶ χόαc δεκαοκτώ, ὁ δὲ
δεύτεροc ποτὶ χόαc δέκα. cυναγόρουc δὲ ἐξέcτω ἑκατέροιc
π̣αρέχεcθαι τέτορας, ἐξέcτω δὲ καὶ μαρτυρὲν τοῖc cυναγόροιc.
τὰ δὲ ψαφίcματα καὶ τὰc προκλήcιc καὶ τὰν γραφὰν τᾶc δίκαc καὶ εἴ τί κ-
α ἄλλο ἐγ δαμοcίου φέρηται ἀναγινωcκέτω ὁ γραμματεὺc ὅν κα ἑ-
κάτεροι παρέχωνται καὶ τὰc μαρτυρίαc ἄνευ ὕδατοc· ὁ δὲ μάρτ-
υρ ὁ μὲν δυνατὸc ἐὼν παρεῖμεν, μαρτυρείτω παρεὼν ἐπὶ τοῦ δικα-
cτηρίου, τοὶ δὲ ἀδύν[α]τοι τῶν μαρτύρων παραγενέcθαι ἐπὶ τὸ δικ-
αcτήριον ἐγμαρτυρηcάντω ἐπὶ τῶν προcτατᾶν ἐν ἑκατέρα[ι]
τᾶι πόλι τετάρται ἐξ ἰκάδοc μηνὸc Βατρομίου δν Καλύμνιοι ἄγοντ[ι,]
Κῶιοι δὲ Καφίcιον, παρεύντων τῶν ἀντιδίκων, εἴ κα χρείζωντι παρῆ-
μεν, τοὶ δὲ μάρτυρεc π[ο]τομνύντω τὸν νόμιμον ὅρκον ἐπὶ τὰμ μ-
αρτυρίαν ἀλαθέα μαρτυρεῖν καὶ μὴ δυνατοὶ ἦμεν παραγενέcθαι ἐπὶ [τ]-
ὸ δικαcτήριον· τοὶ δὲ προcτάται τὰc μαρτ̣υρ̣[ία]c τὰc ἐγμαρτυρηθείκα-
c ἐπ' αὐτῶν ἐπιcαμαινέcθω τᾶι δαμοcί[αι cφρα]γίδι, παραcαμαινέcθω δὲ
καὶ τῶν ἀντιδίκων ὁ χρείζων, ἀντίγραφα [δ]ὲ̣ διδόντω τοὶ προcτάται τ-
αυτᾶν τᾶν μαρτυριᾶν παράχρημα τοῖc ἀντιδίκοιc. ἀποcτειλάντω δὲ
τοὶ προcτάται τᾶμ̣ [μ]ὲν ἐν Κῶι μαρτυρηθειcᾶν μαρτυριᾶν πακᾶν ἀν-
[τί]γραφα, τὰ μὲν ἐc[φρ]αγιcμένα τᾶι δαμοcίαι cφραγίδι, τὰ δὲ ἀcφράγιc-
[τα] ἐπὶ τοὺc προc[τ]άτας τοὺc ἐν Καλύμναι ἐν ἁμέραιc ἵκατι ἀφ' οὗ κα ἐγμαρ-
[τυρ]ηθῆι, ἀποcτ⟨ει⟩λάντω δὲ καὶ τοὶ προcτάται ἐν Καλύμναι τᾶν μ-
[αρτ]υριᾶν τᾶν ἐγμαρτυρηθε[ι]cᾶν ἐφ' αὑτοῖc ἀντίγραφα πακᾶν, τὰ μὲν ἐcφρ-
αγιcμένα τᾶι δαμοcίαι cφραγίδι, τὰ δὲ ἀcφ⟨ρ⟩άγιcτα ποτὶ τοὺc προcτά[τ]-
ας τοὺc ἐγ Κῶι ἐν ἁμέραιc ἵκατι ἀφ' οὗ κα ἐγμαρτυρηθῆι καὶ τὰ ἄλλα [πάντα]
ποιοῦντω τοὶ προcτάται περὶ τᾶν ἐγμαρτυριᾶν καθάπερ καὶ τοὺc ἐ-
ν̣ Κῶι προcτάτας γέγραπται ποιεῖν· τοῖc δὲ παραγενομένοιc Καλυμ-
νίων εἰc Κῶν ἐπὶ τὰν ἐπάκουcιν τᾶν μαρτυριᾶν ἀcφ[άλειαν παρεχ]έ̣τ̣-

ω ἐν Κῶι Φιλῖνος. διδόντω δὲ καὶ ἀνάκριcιν τοὶ c[τραταγοὶ τῶν μαρ]-
τύρων ἑκατέροις καθ' ἕνα μετὰ τοὺc πράτους [λόγους τᾶc δίκας·]
ἀνακρινάντω δὲ καὶ τοὺc μάρτυρας ἑκάτεροι ὅ[ca τὰc δίκας ἰ]-
κνεῖται, ἄλλο δὲ μηδέν, καὶ τὸ ἐρωταθὲν ὑπὸ τ[οῦ μάρτυρος ἀνα]-
γκαζόντω τοὺc ἀντιδίκους τοὶ cτραταγ[οὶ εἰπεῖν, εἴ κα μὴ cυνῆι τὸ ἐ]-
ρωτώμενον, ἐπερωτῆι δὲ ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ τ[οὺc ἀντιδίκους· εἰ δέ κα τοὶ]
λόγοι μὴ cυντελέωνται παρ' ἀμφοτέρ[ων ποτὶ τὰν τήρηcιν τοῦ ὕδατος,]
[λ]εγόντω ἐc ὅ κα τὸ ὕδωρ ἐ[γ]ρυᾶι· cυντελε[cθέντων δὲ τῶν λόγ]-
ων διδόντω τοὶ cτρατα[γο]ὶ τὰc ψάφου[c αὐτίκα μάλα.]

4: [καὶ τῶν δικαcτᾶν π]ερὶ τᾶc δίκας: Herzog. || 7: cυνέθεντο: Berard. [cυν]έθεντο τὰ διάφορα πά[ντα]: Müllensiefen. [τᾶc δίκας τὰν γραφ]ὰν ἔθεντο: Herzog. || 8: Ἀγλαοcτράτου: Berard. || 9: [ποθ' ἂν ἁ πόλιc]: Herzog. || 11: [cυνε]θέν[το]: Berard. || 11–13: [οἳ καὶ ἀπ|έδωκαν τοῖc cτραταγοῖc τό τε ψάφιcμα] τὸ Κ̣αλυμνίων [καὶ τὸ παρὰ| βαcιλέως Δαματρίου διάταγμα γραφὲν ἑκατ]έρ̣οι̣c τούc τε ν̣[όμους]: Herzog. || 16: [ἐπεὶ δὲ ἀμφότεροι τὰ γράμματα cυντετ]ε̣λ̣ε̣cμένοι̣: Herzog. || 17: [τοὶ cτραταγοὶ παραχρῆμα παρὰ κτλ]: Herzog. || 18: ἐν καλεῖν: Berard. || 21: [δόν]τω: Herzog. || 23: [εἰ δὲ κα ὑπερτιμᾶν δοκῆι τὰν δ]ίκαν: Herzog. || 24: ἐπικαλεύμ[ενον ὑπερέχει] τῶν γεγραμμένων, ⟨ὧ⟩ι κα πλ̣[έον] ⟨δίκαν εἰcάγεν⟩: Herzog. || 25–26: Ἐξορκώ[ντω δὲ τοὶ cτραταγοὶ τοὺ]|c δικαcτὰc: Newton, Berard, *RIJG*, Müllensiefen, Dittenberger, Michel, Hiller von Gaertringen, Schwyzer. || 28–29: γ[νώμαν τὰν δικαιοτάτα]|ν: Newton, Berard, *RIJG*, Müllensiefen, Dittenberger, Michel, Hiller von Gaertringen, Schwyzer. || 36: παραδόντω: Newton, Berard, *RIJG*, Müllensiefen, Dittenberger, Michel, Hiller von Gaertringen, Schwyzer. || 66–67: ἀc[φάλειαν δότ]|ω: Newton, Berard, *RIJG*, Müllensiefen, Dittenberger, Michel, Hiller von Gaertringen, Schwyzer. || 70–71: ὑπὸ [τῶν ἀντιδίκων δ|ι]καζόντω: *RIJG*, Müllensiefen, Michel, Schwyzer. [δ|ι]καζόντω: Newton, Berard. || 72: ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ, το[ῦ λόγου ἐκκλαιέcθω]: Schwyzer, Müllensiefen, Michel. || 74: ἐcόκα: Newton, Berard, *RIJG*, Müllensiefen, Michel.

B [- - - καὶ ἐπεὶ ὁ δᾶμος ὁ Καλυμνίων Ἀρατίδαν, Ἐπίγονον, etc. προδίκους]
[ἐc Κνίδον ἀπέcτειλε ἀντωμοcίαν τοῦ ἐνκλήμ]α̣τ̣ος ποιή[c]-
[ομένους ποτί τε Φιλῖνον τὸν Διοκλεῦc,] Ἀριcτόδαμον, Ἄ̣γ-
[λαον, Τειcίαν, Ἀριcτῆ, τὰ Διαγόρα π]αιδία ποτὶ τοὺc γεγ[ρ]-
[αμμένους τὰν γραφὰν τάνδε ἔθ]ε̣ν̣το παρὰ τοὺc Κνιδίων cτρ[ατ]-
[αγοὺc τοὺc ἐν ἀρχᾶ]ι ἐπὶ δαμιοργοῦ Ἀλκιμάχου. ἀργυρί[ο]
[υ τοῦ ἀποδοθέντος] ἀμῖν ἀφαιρεθέντος ἀπὸ χρέως τοῦ Παυc-
[ιμάχου καὶ] Ἱπποκράτευc, τᾶc τε ἀφέcιος τοῦ ταλάντου ὅ φαν-
[τι] ἀφεῖcθαι Καλύμνιοι ὑπὸ Παυcιμάχου καὶ Κλευμήδευc, καὶ τ-
ᾶν φιαλᾶν καὶ τῶν ἀλcέων, καὶ τᾶν πεμπτᾶν ἀφαιρεθειcᾶ-
ν τᾶν ἀποδοcίων ἅc φαντι ἀποδεδώκεν Καλύμνιοι Παυcιμ-
άχωι καὶ Κλευμήδει καθ' ὁμολογίαν ἅμ φαντι ποιήcαcθαι
Καλύμνιοι ποτὶ Παυcίμαχον καὶ Κλευμήδη, περὶ ὧν πάντων
ἀμφιcβατεῦντι αὐτοῖc τοὶ Κλευμήδευc κλαρονόμοι· τού-
των πάντων ἀφαιρεθέντος τοῦ μέρευc ὃ εὑρίcκομες ἐ-
πιπίπτον ἐ⟨π⟩ὶ τὸ χρέος τὸ Ἱπποκράτει ὀφειλόμενον, ἀφα[ι]-

ρεθέντος δὲ καὶ τούτου π⟨λ⟩έονος ἀργυρίου ὅ φαντι Κα⟨λ⟩ύμνιοι ἀποδεδώκεν Κλευμήδηι, καὶ τᾶν ἄλλαν ἀποδοσίων ἀφαιρεθεισᾶν ⟨π⟩ασᾶν, ἃς ἐν τᾶι ἀποκρίσει, ἂν ἔδωκε ὁ δᾶμος ὁ Κώιων τῶι Καλυμνίων δάμωι, ἂν ἔλαβον ἄγγελοι παραγενόμενοι ἐς Κῶν Ἐξάκεστος, Χαρικλεΐδας, Ἀρατόφαντος, Ἀρατίδας, Εὐξίφαντος, γράψαντες ἀνηνίκαμες ἔχοντας τὸς Ἱπποκράτευς κλαρονόμους ἐς τὸ χρέος ὃ ὤφειλον Καλύμνιοι Ἱπποκράτει, ὧι ἄρχει Καφίς[ι]ος ἐπὶ Ἑρμώνακτος· ἀπαιτεύντων δὲ ἁμῶν τὰ ὑπόλοιπα τῶν χρημάτων τούτων, ἃ γίνεται σύν τόκωι, τὰ μέρη τὰ ἁμά, οὐκ ἀποδίδοντι Καλύμνιοι, φάμενοι ἀποδεδώκεν αὐτὰ καὶ τοὺς τόκους τοὺς γινομένους Κλευμήδει τῶι Ἱπποκράτους καὶ Κλευφάντωι τῶι Κλευμήδευς. τίμαμα τῶν χρημάτων ὧν δικαζόμεθα τάλαντα τριάκοντα.

vacat

ἀπεδικάσθη παρόντων· τᾶν ψάφων τὰι καταδικάζουσαι ἑβδομήκοντα ὀκτώ, ταὶ δὲ ἀποδικάζουσαι ἑκατὸν ἵκατι ἕξ· Ἐλαφρίου ἑβδόμαι ἐπὶ δέκα, ἐπὶ δαμιοργοῦ Ἀλκιμάχου· συναγόρησε τοῖς πα[ι]δίοις τοῖς Δια⟨γ⟩όρα Φιλῖνος Διοκλεῦς Κῶιος, τᾶι [δ]ὲ Καλυμνίων πόλι Ἑκατώνυμος Πρυτάνις Μιλήσιος, Ἐξάκηστος Ἀλκίνου Καλύμνιος, Ἀρατόφαντος Ἀριστόλα Καλύμνιος.

vacat

2–3: Ἀγ|[λαοστράτου]: Newton, Berard, *RIJG*, Müllensiefen, Dittenberger, Michel, Hiller von Gaertringen, Schwyzer. || 6: ἀπὸ τοῦ χρέως: Newton, Berard, *RIJG*, Müllensiefen, Dittenberger, Michel, Hiller von Gaertringen, Schwyzer. || 28: Ἱπποκράτους: Segre. || 37: Ἐξάκηστος: Segre.

This document provides us with some of the most extensive procedural details we have regarding general mechanisms of arbitration; but the case is also of interest in its own particulars. It seems logical that matters of disputed debts would commonly be submitted to arbitration; the judicial process would be well suited to dealing with such issues. Nevertheless, evidence for international arbitral settlements of conflicts over debt, or other primarily financial matters, is actually relatively scarce, especially when we compare it with the overwhelming evidence for such issues as boundary disputes.[1] This document is therefore doubly valuable, since it demonstrates that the recognized arbitral procedure was much the same for a case like this as for a boundary dispute.

The Koan-Kalymnian conflict is also of interest in that it shows how a dispute involving private citizens of a state could escalate into or be adopted as a public

1. Cf. **56**, **138**.

concern. At some point considerably prior to the process described in the present inscription, two citizens of Kos had loaned a sum of money to the state of Kalymna. The claimants in this case were the descendants of the original creditors and alleged that the debt incurred by Kalymna was still outstanding. The Kalymnians, on the other hand, claimed that they had liquidated this debt and were under no further obligations. The issue could not be settled, and a full-scale arbitral tribunal was instituted, with the nearby state of Knidos rendering its services as arbitrator. It is clear from the procedure involved that the Koan state took up the cause of its injured bankers.

The second portion of the inscription (B, lines 2–30) reviews the Koan claim in their prosecution of the state of Kalymna. Pausimachos and Hippokrates had made a loan to Kalymna, perhaps around the year 360.[2] Both of the original creditors were now dead. Hippokrates' interests were pursued, first by his son Kleomedes, and then, on the latter's death, by Kleomedes' son Kleophantos. Pausimachos's son Diagoras was also dead, but Diagoras's children, still apparently minors, were represented by Philinos, the Koan advocate in this case. Pausimachos had been responsible for four-fifths of the original loan, Hippokrates for one-fifth. The controversy over whether the debt had already been repaid hinged on the fact that the original creditors were two in number. The Kalymnians apparently argued that they had already paid over the entire balance due on the loan to Kleomedes and Kleophantos. The claim of the children of Diagoras, however, was that this did not represent a complete liquidation of the Kalymnian debt. Kalymna still owed 30 talents to them, the descendants of Pausimachos, a debt that could not be resolved by any payments to the descendants of Hippokrates.

It has been conjectured that the first procedural step the Koans took was an appeal to the original loan agreement, and a possible compulsory arbitration clause.[3] Those who have speculated on a possible obligatory clause have not specified their reasons for doing so; any reference to an agreement between the Koans and the Kalymnians in this inscription could equally well refer to a voluntary ad hoc arrangement. Nevertheless, the compulsory arbitration clause is well known from other cases of arbitration, such as boundary disputes, and a precedent for its appearance here may be found in the loan agreement between the state of Arkesine and Praxikles, a citizen of Naxos. Arkesine and Naxos had a *symbolon* treaty with one another, and any future problems with the repayment of Praxikles' loan were to be arbitrated by a neutral city in accordance with that treaty.[4]

2. For the conjectured date of the loan, see Segre, *Epigraphica*; id., *Annuario* 22–23, p. 121; and Sherwin-White, *Cos*, p. 72.

3. See Dareste, *BCH* 10, p. 236; Phillipson, p. 149; Raeder, p. 131.

4. See **2** Appendix.

Whether there was any obligatory arrangement to go to arbitration, or whether Kos and Kalymna reached a compromisary agreement once the disagreement had arisen, it is possible that the affair was referred to Demetrios Poliorketes for settlement. The editor's restoration of A, line 12, reads [τὸ παρὰ βασιλέως Δαματρίου ποτίταγμα].[5] The ποτίταγμα or πρόσταγμα refers to a command from the king, no doubt a directive to the disputants to submit their dispute to Knidos. It was common enough for a monarch to pass on the task of arbitration to a third city, perhaps by means of a διάγραμμα outlining general rules and regulations to be followed.[6] Demetrios, then, if he were involved with this case, would have passed on the task of judgement to the people of Knidos, although the Koans and Kalymnians evidently also agreed to turn to Knidos on consultation with one another (A, lines 13–14).

The Knidians established a tribunal of 204 individuals, which was presided over by the state's strategoi. In cases where a matter was judged by a large body representative of the people, as opposed to an elite tribunal composed of a small number of judges chosen for reaons of expertise, it was probably common for city magistrates to officiate.[7] The Knidian strategoi were to inform the Koans and Kalymnians of the day of the trial; if written copies of the charge being laid by the children of Diagoras (ἀντίγραφα τοῦ ἐγκλήματος: A, lines 18–20) were not received, the strategoi would refuse to go ahead with the trial. The strategoi were also to receive written affidavits from the Kalymnian *prodikoi* within the same period of time: five days (ἀντίγραφα τᾶς ἀντιγραφᾶς). If the Kalymnians, the defendants, defaulted on this obligation, the strategoi were to judge in favour of the children of Diagoras.

The arbitration process described in this document was to begin with the deposition of affidavits with the arbitrating state, the Koan γραφή and the Kalymnian ἀντιγραφή. The extensive use of written materials and affidavits may be typical of arbitration cases as a whole, even the ones that are only briefly recorded and give no details as to procedure. Some other cases do refer to the written documentation that accompanied the decision-making process.[8] The particular requirements of this case, however, may have demanded more in the way of written transcripts. The Knidian judges were not visiting the states in question; instead they were making their decision in their own hometown, and so required a great deal in the way of written affidavits. The fact that the central point of dispute in this case was money, not land, may also have been a factor.

5. A conjecture based on comparison with other Kalymnian inscriptions; see Segre, *Annuario*, pp. 101, 103.

6. For arbitrations involving a royal διάγραμμα see **13**, **15**, **54**.

7. For arbitral decisions given either by city assemblies or by a large group representative of the people see **3**, **39**, **100**, **159**, **164**. The oath to be taken by the members of this tribunal is preserved at A, lines 25–32; cf. the oaths of the judges and their escorts in **129**.

8. For example, **26**, **74**, **129**.

In keeping with the emphasis on written documentation in this case, regulations were set down regarding the production of evidence such as documents from the state archives. Copies of such documents to be used as evidence were to be officially sealed by the public seal of the home state to prevent tampering and guarantee legitimacy. This evidence would then be conveyed to the Knidian strategoi, who would be responsible for breaking the seals and making the evidence available to the advocates of both parties. All such evidence was to be produced prior to the trial. Detailed procedural rules were also applied to verbal witness (A, lines 45–72). Those witnesses who could make the journey to Knidos were expected to do so and present themselves before the tribunal in order to give their evidence in person. It was recognized, however, that some witnesses would be unable to make the trip; some provision was necessary for the hearing of their testimony. Those who were unable to give their evidence in person were therefore allowed to give it by proxy (ἐκμαρτυρία). On a fixed day, in both Kos and Kalymna, these witnesses were to go before the *prostatai* and give sworn depositions of their testimony. Before doing so they were to take an oath that they were telling the truth, and that they were indeed unable to attend the trial.[9]

It was the right of both states, if they wished, to have their representatives present in the opponent state when these witnesses gave their evidence, though nothing is said of any right of cross-examination under these circumstances. Copies were to be made of the testimony given. It was up to the *prostatai* of Kalymna and Kos to seal (ἐπισαμαινέσθω) the evidence given before them. The representative of the opposing state then had the right to set a counterseal on the documents (παρασαμαινέσθω). One copy of the testimony was to be sealed in this fashion and would apparently act as the official version; the other, to be left unsealed, would presumably serve as an unofficial reference document for the interested parties. The two disputing states were then to exchange copies of all the evidence given in this manner, an act that had to be carried out within twenty days.[10]

Witnesses produced at the trial itself were to be subject to cross-examination (ἀνάκρισις) by the opposing side. Indeed, the rules governing the trial procedure in general emphasized guarantees that each side would be given exactly the same treatment. Each side was allowed four συνάγοροι (advocates), who could also

9. An additional oath was taken (ποτόμνυμι) as well as the regular oath (νόμιμος ὅρκος) about telling the truth.

10. Another regulation with respect to the hearing of evidence involved the safety of Kalymnian representatives who might be present in Kos. They represented a state that was allegedly a debtor and hence ran the risk of personal distraint. It was therefore ruled that Philinos, the Koan advocate, and the representative of Pausimachos's heirs, should give them a guarantee of safe conduct (ἀσφάλεια) and immunity for themselves and their goods. See *RIJG*, p. 175; Migeotte, p. 206.

act as witnesses. The advocates speaking for both parties were to be given the same amount of time to state their case and make their argument: 18 measures of the water clock for the first argument, 10 for the rebuttal.[11] A certain degree of leeway was allowed for the reading of the written evidence: the water was to be temporarily stopped (A, lines 43–45). Both parties, however, had to have completed their pleas before the water ran out, or they would be cut short (A, lines 72–75). The Knidian strategoi were to call for a vote as soon as the speeches were finished.

The final portion of the inscription shows that Philinos's advocacy did not convince the Knidian judges (B, lines 31–38). The verdict was given in favour of the defendant, Kalymna, by a vote of 126 to 78; no reason is given for the findings of the court. The inscription concludes with a list of the advocates.

22. Pausanias of Thessaly judges a border dispute between Amphissa and Delphi, (c. 290–280?)

The same inscription as **1** and **163** (the inscription of 125 B.C., column B, lines 28–32).

Pomtow, *SIG*^{3} 614, n. 4; 826E, n. 20; id., *Klio* 16 (1919) pp. 139f.; id., *Klio* 18 (1923) p. 271, no. XX; Lerat, pp. 52f. For further bibliography see the citations in **1** and **163**.

Ἀμφικτίονες ἐπέγνωσαν περὶ ὅρων Ἀπόλλωνος, ποίοις ὅροις
ὁρίσασθαι δεῖ.[vv] Ἀμφισσεῖς Ἀριστοκλέας, Δάμων πρεσβευτ[αὶ ἐλ]έγοσαν ὅτι
δεῖ τὸ κρίμα ἐστηκὸς καὶ κύριον εἶναι τὸ τότε γεγονός, ὅτε Παυσανίας
Θεσσαλὸς καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ ὅρους ἐποίησαν.[vv] Ἀντικυρεῖς, Ἀμ[βρ]ύσσιοι,
Δελφοὶ ἐλέγοσαν τούτωι τῶι κρίματι ἐστηκὸς καὶ κύριον εἶναι δεῖν, ὅτε
[ὅ]ρον ἱερομνήμονες πεποί[η]καν καὶ [κ]ε[κ]ρίκασιν ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Ὀ[ρνι]χίδα
ἐν Δελφοῖς·[vvv] ὑπὲρ τούτων τοὺς λόγους ἐποήσατο Νικάτας Ἀλκίνου
[Δ]ελφός.[v] ἔκριναν·[v] Δελφῶν ψᾶφοι δύο· ἱερομνημόνων κρί[ματι στ]ῆναι.
[v] Θεσσαλῶν ψῆφοι δύο· ἱερομνημόνων κρίματι στῆναι. κτλ.

This arbitration, carried out by Pausanias of Thessaly and his commission, was another in the long series of boundary regulations concerning Delphi and its neighbours, particularly Amphissa. The source for this case is the same as that for the arbitration of c. 338/7: the document from c. 125 B.C. (**163**). At that time, the Delphian envoys invoked the earlier settlement of 338/7, and the Amphissans a settlement handed down by "Pausanias the Thessalian and

11. A, lines 39–42. Philinos was the Koan *synegoros*; the Kalymnians were represented by two Kalymnians and a Milesian.

act as witnesses. The advocates speaking for both parties were to be given the same amount of time to state their case and make their argument: 18 measures of the water clock for the first argument, 10 for the rebuttal.[11] A certain degree of leeway was allowed for the reading of the written evidence: the water was to be temporarily stopped (A, lines 43–45). Both parties, however, had to have completed their pleas before the water ran out, or they would be cut short (A, lines 72–75). The Knidian strategoi were to call for a vote as soon as the speeches were finished.

The final portion of the inscription shows that Philinos's advocacy did not convince the Knidian judges (B, lines 31–38). The verdict was given in favour of the defendant, Kalymna, by a vote of 126 to 78; no reason is given for the findings of the court. The inscription concludes with a list of the advocates.

22. Pausanias of Thessaly judges a border dispute between Amphissa and Delphi, (c. 290–280?)

The same inscription as **1** and **163** (the inscription of 125 B.C., column B, lines 28–32).

Pomtow, *SIG*^{3} 614, n. 4; 826E, n. 20; id., *Klio* 16 (1919) pp. 139f.; id., *Klio* 18 (1923) p. 271, no. XX; Lerat, pp. 52f. For further bibliography see the citations in **1** and **163**.

Ἀμφικτίονες ἐπέγνωσαν περὶ ὅρων Ἀπόλλωνος, ποίοις ὅροις
ὁρίσασθαι δεῖ.[vv] Ἀμφισσεῖς Ἀριστοκλέας, Δάμων πρεσβευτ[αὶ ἐλ]έγοσαν ὅτι
δεῖ τὸ κρίμα ἐστηκὸς καὶ κύριον εἶναι τὸ τότε γεγονός, ὅτε Παυσανίας
Θεσσαλὸς καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ ὅρους ἐποίησαν.[vv] Ἀντικυρεῖς, Ἀμ[βρ]ύσσιοι,
Δελφοὶ ἐλέγοσαν τούτωι τῶι κρίματι ἐστηκὸς καὶ κύριον εἶναι δεῖν, ὅτε
[ὅ]ρον ἱερομνήμονες πεποί[η]καν καὶ [κ]ε[κ]ρίκασιν ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Ὀ[ρνι]χίδα
ἐν Δελφοῖς·[vvv] ὑπὲρ τούτων τοὺς λόγους ἐποήσατο Νικάτας Ἀλκίνου
[Δ]ελφός.[v] ἔκριναν·[v] Δελφῶν ψᾶφοι δύο· ἱερομνημόνων κρί[ματι στ]ῆναι.
[v] Θεσσαλῶν ψῆφοι δύο· ἱερομνημόνων κρίματι στῆναι. κτλ.

This arbitration, carried out by Pausanias of Thessaly and his commission, was another in the long series of boundary regulations concerning Delphi and its neighbours, particularly Amphissa. The source for this case is the same as that for the arbitration of c. 338/7: the document from c. 125 B.C. (**163**). At that time, the Delphian envoys invoked the earlier settlement of 338/7, and the Amphissans a settlement handed down by "Pausanias the Thessalian and

11. A, lines 39–42. Philinos was the Koan *synegoros*; the Kalymnians were represented by two Kalymnians and a Milesian.

those with him." Presumably the dispute was over the same territory as in 1. Under Pausanias, however, the case was clearly decided in favour of the Amphissans.

It is impossible to assign a certain date to the work of Pausanias and his commission. Colin favoured a date of around 196 B.C., in the context of Flamininus's settlements in the wake of the defeat of Philip V.[1] Pomtow wavered between a disparate choice of dates, ranging from the early third century to the immediate aftermath of the Third Macedonian War. His views were coloured by his belief that Pausanias's arbitration did not involve the sacred land; yet it is quite clear from the inscription of 125 B.C. that the issue was the same in 337, in the time of Pausanias, and in 125: claims on the sacred land of Apollo.[2] Daux, followed by others, argued for an earlier date, prior even to the arbitration in the time of Ornichidas (1).[3] Daux believed Pausanias to have been acting in the capacity of a hieromnemon; but the phraseology of the inscription, which opposes the decision of Pausanias to a hieromnemonic judgement, seems to argue against this.

Absolute certainty as to the date of the Thessalian arbitration seems unobtainable. One of the periods suggested by Pomtow was the early years of the Aitolian supremacy at Delphi, the years around and following the second decade of the third century. For the sake of convenience this tentative date has been used here, but it should not be taken as assured. One dubious factor in favour of this date is the fact that so many Amphissans were cultivating the sacred land when the Roman Glabrio rededicated various segments of it. This might suggest that sometime in the century and a half intervening between the judgement of the hieromnemones in 338/7 (1) and that of Glabrio in 190 (**88**), Amphissa had received a favourable judgement. Pausanias's tribunal may have been the one to give such a judgement. On the other hand, it remains true that the Amphissans probably did not need a *legal* decision in order to encroach on the sacred land in the first place.

23. Thessalian Larisa arbitrates between the Hypoknemidian and Epiknemidian Lokrians (?) (c. 290–280?)

A fragment of an inscription from Delphi. H (max.): 0.22 m; w (max.): 0.225 m; d: 0.05 m.

1. G. Colin, *BCH* 27 (1903) pp. 141f.
2. Pomtow, *SIG*^{3} 614, 826; id., *Klio* 16.
3. Daux, *Delphes,* pp. 379f.; cf. Plassart, *FDelphes*, vol. III.4, 3, p. 14; G. Roux, *L'Amphictionie, Delphes et le temple d'Apollon au IVe siècle* (Lyon, 1979) p. 56.

those with him." Presumably the dispute was over the same territory as in 1. Under Pausanias, however, the case was clearly decided in favour of the Amphissans.

It is impossible to assign a certain date to the work of Pausanias and his commission. Colin favoured a date of around 196 B.C., in the context of Flamininus's settlements in the wake of the defeat of Philip V.[1] Pomtow wavered between a disparate choice of dates, ranging from the early third century to the immediate aftermath of the Third Macedonian War. His views were coloured by his belief that Pausanias's arbitration did not involve the sacred land; yet it is quite clear from the inscription of 125 B.C. that the issue was the same in 337, in the time of Pausanias, and in 125: claims on the sacred land of Apollo.[2] Daux, followed by others, argued for an earlier date, prior even to the arbitration in the time of Ornichidas (1).[3] Daux believed Pausanias to have been acting in the capacity of a hieromnemon; but the phraseology of the inscription, which opposes the decision of Pausanias to a hieromnemonic judgement, seems to argue against this.

Absolute certainty as to the date of the Thessalian arbitration seems unobtainable. One of the periods suggested by Pomtow was the early years of the Aitolian supremacy at Delphi, the years around and following the second decade of the third century. For the sake of convenience this tentative date has been used here, but it should not be taken as assured. One dubious factor in favour of this date is the fact that so many Amphissans were cultivating the sacred land when the Roman Glabrio rededicated various segments of it. This might suggest that sometime in the century and a half intervening between the judgement of the hieromnemones in 338/7 (1) and that of Glabrio in 190 (**88**), Amphissa had received a favourable judgement. Pausanias's tribunal may have been the one to give such a judgement. On the other hand, it remains true that the Amphissans probably did not need a *legal* decision in order to encroach on the sacred land in the first place.

23. Thessalian Larisa arbitrates between the Hypoknemidian and Epiknemidian Lokrians (?) (c. 290–280?)

A fragment of an inscription from Delphi. H (max.): 0.22 m; w (max.): 0.225 m; d: 0.05 m.

1. G. Colin, *BCH* 27 (1903) pp. 141f.
2. Pomtow, *SIG*^{3} 614, 826; id., *Klio* 16.
3. Daux, *Delphes,* pp. 379f.; cf. Plassart, *FDelphes*, vol. III.4, 3, p. 14; G. Roux, *L'Amphictionie, Delphes et le temple d'Apollon au IVe siècle* (Lyon, 1979) p. 56.

Pomtow, *Klio* 18 (1923) p. 261, no. 201; Crönert, *SEG* II.264; *G. Daux, *BCH* 66–67 (1942–43) pp. 143–46.

Daux, *Delphes*, p. 336; Robert, *REG* 1943, 34.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - Λυκίδαο, Ανι . . c. 8 . .
- - - - - - - - - - - - -Ιειππειοιο ᵛ'Ιππα . . c. 5 . .
[- - - - - - - - - - - Θ]ερσουνίδαο, Ἀγησάνδ̣[ρ . 3 max. .]
[- - - - - - - - - - - ἑ]ξεικάττιοι τὸ πολίτευμ[α . 2 max. .]
- - - - - - - - - - - -ουθειεν δικασταὶ ἐς τοῦν . 2 max. .
- - - - - - - - - - - - -ον ψάφος ἐλλάβοιεν οἱ Ὀποέ̣[ν]-
[τιοι - - - - - - - - - - - - -]ἐ̣βδεμείκοντα καταγορεῖσαι
- - - - - - - - - - - - -ας, Ἀντιγένεις, Εὐγείτουν ᵛ
- - - - - - - - - - - - -ΕΝΤΟΥΝ, Ἐπικναμιδδίουν, Οἰν-
- - - - - - - - - - - -ΟΣΚΙΣΟΥΝ Ακουσιοος, Παυσανια[ι?]
[- - - - - -? - - - - - -]ᵛᵃᶜ

2: [Ξανθίπποιο Νικα]σιππείοιο: suggested by Pomtow. ἱππαρ[χέντος?- -]: Pomtow. || 3: [Νικοδρόμοιο Θ]ερσουνίδαο: suggested by Pomtow. || 5: ουθιειεν δικασταὶ: Pomtow. θί(ε)ιεν: Hiller von Gaertringen. δικασταὶ ἐς τοῦν [πολιτάουν ἁπάντουν]: suggested by Pomtow. [κλαρ]ουθεῖεν δικασταὶ ἐς τοῦν [πολιτᾶν πάντουν]: suggested by Robert. || 6: [ἑκατ?]ὸν ψάφος ἐλλάβοιεν οἱ ΟΓΟΙ[-]: Pomtow. ὅροι [τοῦν]: suggested by Crönert. Ὀπόη̣[τιοι]: Hiller von Gaertringen. || 7: [τριά?κ]οντα κατὰ τὸ[.]ΕΙΣΛ[-]: Pomtow. || 7–8: [ἁμέρας τριάκ]οντα κατὰ τὸ[ν] εἰσα[γωγιμὸν (sc. νόμον) δικ]ά̣σαντ[ουν]: suggested by Crönert. || 9: [Ἐμπε]δίουν: Pomtow. [Βρ]έντουν: Crönert. || 10: [Ἀ?]σκίσουν, Ἀκουσίου̣[ν], Παυσανί[ας.]: Pomtow.

This heavily mutilated inscription from Delphi was thought by Pomtow, the first editor, to refer to a group of six hundred δικασταί, whom he argued, on prosopographical and dialectal grounds, came from Thessalian Larisa. As usual, the large number of judges may point to the "democratic" ideal of equity rather than expertise.[1] Pomtow speculated (surely on the basis of statistical probability) that the issue was a boundary dispute, and he suggested that Opous, an important town in the ethnic group of the Hypoknemidian Lokrians, might be one of the parties to the quarrel.

Based on the dialectal forms, Pomtow would have assigned this inscription to the middle of the third century. However, he did not believe the political circumstances of the time to have been suitable; Larisa, during the century when the Aitolians controlled Delphi, should not have been in charge of a boundary arbitration in Delphi. He therefore dated this arbitration to 189 or 188, when the new Thessalian *koinon* was instituted, with Larisa as its capital, and connected this arbitration to the general redrawing of boundaries following the defeat of the Aitolians in their war with Rome. But a third-century date for this document

1. For the extremely large number, compare **159**.

could be maintained if it can be assigned to the early years before the Aitolian domination of the Delphic Amphiktyony was absolute.[2] Thessaly could still have provided the arbitrator, although it may well not have been Larisa; Pomtow's belief that Larisa was involved has no firm foundation in the extant fragment of the inscription. Furthermore there is nothing to back up Pomtow's assertion that this was a boundary arbitration. Other possibilities exist, such as that of a dispute over religious jurisdiction. Daux suggested that the inscription might have recorded the settlement of a conflict between the Hypoknemidian and Epiknemidian Lokrians over the representation of East Lokris in the Amphiktyony.[3] Perhaps a Thessalian arbitrated the question of Lokrian representation around the same time that Pausanias the Thessalian arbitrated the issue of the sacred lands of Delphi (**22**). Still, this arbitration (if it was one) may not have involved Delphi at all; the inscription may simply have been recorded there. With such fragmented evidence, any conclusions must remain conjectural.

24. Lysimachos awards a sacred precinct to Samothrace (288–281)

An inscribed stele discovered on Samothrace. H: 0.35 m; w: 0.375 m; d: 0.075 m.

*J. R. McCredie, *Hesperia* 37 (1968) p. 220.

Robert, *REG* 1969, 441; Will, vol. 1, p. 102.

[Ἔδοξ]ε [τῆι β]ουλῆι· ἐπειδὴ Βασι-
λεὺς Λυσίμαχος φίλος ὢν καὶ εὔ-
νους διατελεῖ τῆι πόλει καὶ πρ[ό]-
τερόν [τ]ε εὐεργέτηκεν ἡμᾶς καὶ
νῦν κ[εκομί]σμεθα τὴν ἱερὰν χώρα-
[ν τῆς ἠπε]ί[ρο]υ ἣν οἱ βασιλεῖς Φί-
[λιππ]ος καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος ἐτεμένι-
[σαν το]ῖς Θεοῖς καὶ ἀνέθεσαν καὶ
. . . . . ια τοῦ τεμένους κατέκρ-
[ινεν τῶν .]ιονος παίδων ἀποδοῦ[ν]-
[αι . . . . . .]ισα πάντα ἀφ' οὗ χρόν-
[ου . . . . . .]σαι ἐγβαλόντες ἡμ-
[ᾶς . . . . . .]ι τὸ ἱερὸν ος . . .
. . . . . αι διατελ . .
. . . . . ΤΟΝ . . . .

2. Daux (*BCH* 66–67) preferred a third-century date, nearer the beginning than the middle.

3. Daux, *BCH* 66–67, p. 146. Cf. **133**, **139**, **166**, **167**.

could be maintained if it can be assigned to the early years before the Aitolian domination of the Delphic Amphiktyony was absolute.[2] Thessaly could still have provided the arbitrator, although it may well not have been Larisa; Pomtow's belief that Larisa was involved has no firm foundation in the extant fragment of the inscription. Furthermore there is nothing to back up Pomtow's assertion that this was a boundary arbitration. Other possibilities exist, such as that of a dispute over religious jurisdiction. Daux suggested that the inscription might have recorded the settlement of a conflict between the Hypoknemidian and Epiknemidian Lokrians over the representation of East Lokris in the Amphiktyony.[3] Perhaps a Thessalian arbitrated the question of Lokrian representation around the same time that Pausanias the Thessalian arbitrated the issue of the sacred lands of Delphi (**22**). Still, this arbitration (if it was one) may not have involved Delphi at all; the inscription may simply have been recorded there. With such fragmented evidence, any conclusions must remain conjectural.

24. Lysimachos awards a sacred precinct to Samothrace (288–281)

An inscribed stele discovered on Samothrace. H: 0.35 m; w: 0.375 m; d: 0.075 m.

*J. R. McCredie, *Hesperia* 37 (1968) p. 220.

Robert, *REG* 1969, 441; Will, vol. 1, p. 102.

[Ἔδοξ]ε [τῆι β]ουλῆι· ἐπειδὴ Βασι-
λεὺς Λυσίμαχος φίλος ὢν καὶ εὔ-
νους διατελεῖ τῆι πόλει καὶ πρ[ό]-
τερόν [τ]ε εὐεργέτηκεν ἡμᾶς καὶ
νῦν κ[εκομί]σμεθα τὴν ἱερὰν χώρα-
[ν τῆς ἠπε]ί[ρο]υ ἣν οἱ βασιλεῖς Φί-
[λιππ]ος καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος ἐτεμένι-
[σαν το]ῖς Θεοῖς καὶ ἀνέθεσαν καὶ
. . . . . ια τοῦ τεμένους κατέκρ-
[ινεν τῶν .]ιονος παίδων ἀποδοῦ[ν]-
[αι . . . . . .]ισα πάντα ἀφ' οὗ χρόν-
[ου . . . . . .]σαι ἐγβαλόντες ἡμ-
[ᾶς . . . . . .]ι τὸ ἱερὸν ος . . .
. . . . . αι διατελ . .
. . . . . ΤΟΝ . . . .

2. Daux (*BCH* 66–67) preferred a third-century date, nearer the beginning than the middle.

3. Daux, *BCH* 66–67, p. 146. Cf. **133**, **139**, **166**, **167**.

This inscription records a decree of the council on Samothrace. It is an honorary decree promulgated in gratitude to King Lysimachos. Among other benefits that he had conferred upon the Samothracians, he apparently was also to be thanked for the part he had played in the Samothracians' regaining a tract of land on the mainland. This territory consisted of a sacred precinct that had been delimited and dedicated to the gods of the Samothracian mysteries by Philip and Alexander.[1] The Samothracians had subsequently lost the jurisdiction of this sacred land, perhaps as the result of encroachments by a mainland Thracian neighbour. Lysimachos was responsible for the restoration of the precinct to the control of Samothrace, and the language of the inscription implies that this may have come about as the result of a judicial decision on the part of the king.[2] If so, we might compare his boundary arbitration between Samos and Priene (**26**), or the (abortive?) arbitration between Philippi and the Thracians ordered by Alexander the Great (5).

25. Lysimachos settles a conflict between Magnesia (and the "Pedieis") and Priene (?) (287/6)

Four fragments of a document originally inscribed on the temple of Athena Polias at Priene. A: h: 0.11 m; w: 0.14 m; d: 0.117 m. B: h: 0.29 m; w: 0.25 m; d: 0.15 m. C: h: 0.28 m; w: 0.38 m; d: 0.18 m. D: h: 0.20 m; w: 0.29 m; d: 0.35 m.

Hicks, *BMus* 410; Kern, *IMagM*, p. xiii, no. 50; *Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene* 16; Welles, *RC* 8.

Sherwin-White, *JHS* 105 (1985) pp. 76f.

A [- - - - - - - - κατ]ὰ κώμ[ας - - - - - - - - - - -]
B - - - - - - - - one line missing - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - . . . . . c παI- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
[- - - . δεδ]ώκαμεν - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
5 [- - -κ]όσιν ἡμᾶς μεγ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - -μεν ἡμεῖς εἰς τὴν - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - -ν ἐν ἡμέραις τριά[κοντα - - - - - - - - - - -]
[- κ]αὶ παροικεῖν καὶ ἐν τ- - - - - - - - - - - - -
[. . . . .]ψάμενοι κατὰ - - -ι ὑπολαμβάνοντες ἐπ[ὶ τὸ] C
10 [ἄμεινον? - - - - - - - - -] κάτασκευάζειν Πεδιεῦς[ιν]
[- - - - - - - - - - - - δε]δώκαμεν· Πεδιεῖς δὲ τὴ[ν]

1. Either Philip II and Alexander the Great or, more probably, Philip III Arrhidaios and Alexander IV. See McCredie, p. 221.

2. Lines 9–10: κατέκρ|[ινεν].

This inscription records a decree of the council on Samothrace. It is an honorary decree promulgated in gratitude to King Lysimachos. Among other benefits that he had conferred upon the Samothracians, he apparently was also to be thanked for the part he had played in the Samothracians' regaining a tract of land on the mainland. This territory consisted of a sacred precinct that had been delimited and dedicated to the gods of the Samothracian mysteries by Philip and Alexander.[1] The Samothracians had subsequently lost the jurisdiction of this sacred land, perhaps as the result of encroachments by a mainland Thracian neighbour. Lysimachos was responsible for the restoration of the precinct to the control of Samothrace, and the language of the inscription implies that this may have come about as the result of a judicial decision on the part of the king.[2] If so, we might compare his boundary arbitration between Samos and Priene (**26**), or the (abortive?) arbitration between Philippi and the Thracians ordered by Alexander the Great (5).

25. Lysimachos settles a conflict between Magnesia (and the "Pedieis") and Priene (?) (287/6)

Four fragments of a document originally inscribed on the temple of Athena Polias at Priene. A: h: 0.11 m; w: 0.14 m; d: 0.117 m. B: h: 0.29 m; w: 0.25 m; d: 0.15 m. C: h: 0.28 m; w: 0.38 m; d: 0.18 m. D: h: 0.20 m; w: 0.29 m; d: 0.35 m.

Hicks, *BMus* 410; Kern, *IMagM*, p. xiii, no. 50; *Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene* 16; Welles, *RC* 8.

Sherwin-White, *JHS* 105 (1985) pp. 76f.

A [- - - - - - - - κατ]ὰ κώμ[ας - - - - - - - - - - -]
B - - - - - - - - one line missing - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - . . . . . c παI- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
[- - - . δεδ]ώκαμεν - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
5 [- - -κ]όσιν ἡμᾶς μεγ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - -μεν ἡμεῖς εἰς τὴν - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - -ν ἐν ἡμέραις τριά[κοντα - - - - - - - - - - -]
[- κ]αὶ παροικεῖν καὶ ἐν τ- - - - - - - - - - - - -
[. . . . .]ψάμενοι κατὰ - - -ι ὑπολαμβάνοντες ἐπ[ὶ τὸ] C
10 [ἄμεινον? - - - - - - - - -] κάτασκευάζειν Πεδιεῦς[ιν]
[- - - - - - - - - - - - δε]δώκαμεν· Πεδιεῖς δὲ τὴ[ν]

1. Either Philip II and Alexander the Great or, more probably, Philip III Arrhidaios and Alexander IV. See McCredie, p. 221.

2. Lines 9–10: κατέκρ|[ινεν].

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - καὶ πολλοὺς μὲν Πριηνέων
[ἀποκτείναντες τὰς αὐτῶν χώρ]ας διήρπα[c]αν, τῶν δὲ ἀπ[ο]-
[δράντων καὶ ἀγαναχτησάντων - - - ἐ]πὶ τοῖς πεπραγμέ-
15 [νοις οὐδένα λόγον ἐποιήσαντο, ἀλλ' αὐτοῖς ὡ]c ἐναντίοις
. . . ϙοιεI . . δ[- - ἐὰν οὖν? τις περὶ ἐκείνων οἳ τὴν χώρ]αν ἔφθειρον
D [γρ]άψηται ἐν τῶι χρόν[ωι τῶι αὐτῶι ὅτι εἶχον τὴν χώραν,]
ἀπαλλαccόμενοι -
Μαγνηcίαι εἰcάγ[ειν - - - - - - - τοῖc δὲ φθείραcι τὰ βαcι]-
20 λικὰ εἶναι κατὰ ταὐ[τὰ καθὰ καὶ τοῖc προειρημένοιc. ἔρρωcθε?]

Hicks, Kern, and Welles place fragment A after fragment D. 4: [ἀπεδ]ώκαμεν τιμ[ὴν?]: Hicks, Kern. [ἀποδεδ]ώκαμεν τιμὰ[c]: Welles. || 4–5: [τοῖc ὠφε|ληκ]όcιν ἡμᾶc μεγ[άλωc?]: Hicks, Kern. || 6: εἰc τὴν [χώραν?]: Hicks, Kern. || 8: ἐν [τούτῳ]: Hicks, Kern. || 8–9: [κα|ταcτρ]εψάμενοι: Hicks, Kern. || 10–11: [τὴν χώραν ταύτην] κατακκευάζειν Πεδιεῦc[ιν| κατοικοῦcιν αὐτὴν νέμεcθαι? ἐ]δώκαμεν: Hicks, Kern. || 13–14: ἀπο|[φυγόντων]: Hicks. || 14: [πρὸc αὐτοὺc ἐ]πὶ κτλ: Hicks, Kern. || 15–16: [ὡ]c ἐναντίοις| [ἐχρῶντο?]: Hicks, Kern, Welles. || 16: [τιc ὢν τὴν χώρ]αν: Hicks, Kern. || 19: εἰcαγό[ντων?]: Hicks, Kern.

This inscription is quite heavily fragmented, and its overall sense uncertain, but it may refer to a judicial settlement that a Hellenistic king was prepared to make between Priene and, perhaps, its neighbour Magnesia.[1] The document is a letter to Priene from a monarch, generally assigned to the third century B.C. The references to the troubles that Priene was having with the "Pedieis," and possibly Magnesia, make it tempting to associate this document with others that also refer to such troubles, and that are specifically connected with Lysimachos.[2] In the opening lines of this inscription, the monarch mentions the "Pedieis," a people living in the plain around the mouth of the Maiander. He had found that Priene was unable to work its land to the full and so had granted to the Pedieis the right to become πάροικοι of Priene, in the interest of efficient use of the land.[3] This arrangement, however, which had been intended to benefit both the Prienians and the Pedieis, proved to be unworkable. The Pedieis, perhaps incited by the Magnesians, rose against the Prienians and were responsible for much destruction of property, and physical violence. It may be that these acts of violence on the part of the Pedieis are to be connected with the general campaigns of Demetrios Poliorketes. We know from *OGIS* 11 and 12 that Priene suffered from the depredations of the Pedieis and the Magnesians in addition to that of Demetrios's forces. This letter may have been an attempt to bring about a peaceful arrangement locally once the major crisis had passed.

1. Cf. **120**.
2. *OGIS* 11, 12; Welles, *RC* 6.
3. See *OGIS* 11, n. 4; Welles, *RC*, p. 53.

The latter portion of the inscription is extremely fragmented, but it may point to a promise by Lysimachos to arbitrate the issue of the acts of war perpetrated against Priene by its neighbours. It seems clear that the Pedieis were perceived as acting in an aggressively hostile fashion; nevertheless, the language of the inscription suggests that a judicial settlement, rather than an arbitrarily imposed punishment, was contemplated.[4] The temple of Athena Polias at Priene, the provenance of this inscription, was home to a number of judicial decisions that were handed down in disputes between Priene and its neighbours.[5]

26. Lysimachos arbitrates between Priene and Samos (283/2)

I: Inscription on a white marble stele found at Samos. H: 0.57 m; w: 0.45 m; d: 0.16 m.

R. Chandler, *Marmora Oxoniensia* II (Oxford, 1763) 25; Böckh, *CIG* 2254; Hicks 152; Berard 39, VIII; Michel 36; Dittenberger, *OGIS* 13; Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene* T 500; Schroeter 6; *Welles, *RC* 7.

II: A passage in *IPriene* 37 (lines 125–31), the document that provides evidence for the later Rhodian arbitration between Priene and Samos (**74**, q.v. for editions and bibliography).

H. Röhl, *Beiträge zur griechische Epigraphik* (Berlin, 1876) p. 7; E. L. Hicks, *BMus*, vol. III.1, pp. 1–5; Lenschau, *LS*, pp. 125–30, 135f., 201–3; A. Wilhelm, *GGA* 160 (1898) p. 208; U. von Wilamowitz, *SPAW* 25 (1906) pp. 38f.; Phillipson, p. 147; Raeder 34; Tod 61 and pp. 135f.; C. D. Buck, *CPh* 8 (1913) p. 151; Lécrivain, pp.12–13; G. Corradi, *RFIC* 50 (1922) pp. 23–24; Meyer, *Grenzen*, pp. 29, 39; P. Jouguet, *Macedonian Imperialism*, trans. M. R. Dobie (London, 1928) p. 408; Tod, *Sidelights*, pp. 53f.; Holleaux, *Études*, vol. 1, p. 405; Magie, *RRAM*, vol. 1, p. 78; C. Roebuck, *CPh* 50 (1955) pp. 60–61; Ténékidès, p. 547; C. Habicht, *MDAI(A)* 72 (1957) pp. 167–69; Préaux, p. 250; Klose, pp. 144–45; W. Orth, *Königlicher Machtanspruch und städtische Freiheit* (Munich, 1977) p. 105; C. Préaux, *Le monde hellénistique* II (Paris, 1978) pp. 422–23; S. M. Burstein, *Ancient World* 3 (1980) p. 76; Bagnall/Derow 12; Burstein 12; S. M. Sherwin-White, *JHS* 105 (1985) p. 80; Shipley, pp. 31–37, 181–82, 266–68; Daverio Rocchi, pp. 170–77.

4. The terms γράψηται (line 17) and εἰcά[γειν]/εἰcαγό[ντων] seem to imply legal action (see Hicks, p. 25). It is also possible that Rhodes somehow became involved in the hostilities between Priene and Magnesia; see Ager, *Historia* 40 (1991) pp. 12–13.

5. See Sherwin-White, *JHS* 105, for a discussion of this Prienian archive. Cf. **74**, **100**, **160**.

The latter portion of the inscription is extremely fragmented, but it may point to a promise by Lysimachos to arbitrate the issue of the acts of war perpetrated against Priene by its neighbours. It seems clear that the Pedieis were perceived as acting in an aggressively hostile fashion; nevertheless, the language of the inscription suggests that a judicial settlement, rather than an arbitrarily imposed punishment, was contemplated.[4] The temple of Athena Polias at Priene, the provenance of this inscription, was home to a number of judicial decisions that were handed down in disputes between Priene and its neighbours.[5]

26. Lysimachos arbitrates between Priene and Samos (283/2)

I: Inscription on a white marble stele found at Samos. H: 0.57 m; w: 0.45 m; d: 0.16 m.

R. Chandler, *Marmora Oxoniensia* II (Oxford, 1763) 25; Böckh, *CIG* 2254; Hicks 152; Berard 39, VIII; Michel 36; Dittenberger, *OGIS* 13; Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene* T 500; Schroeter 6; *Welles, *RC* 7.

II: A passage in *IPriene* 37 (lines 125–31), the document that provides evidence for the later Rhodian arbitration between Priene and Samos (**74**, q.v. for editions and bibliography).

H. Röhl, *Beiträge zur griechische Epigraphik* (Berlin, 1876) p. 7; E. L. Hicks, *BMus*, vol. III.1, pp. 1–5; Lenschau, *LS*, pp. 125–30, 135f., 201–3; A. Wilhelm, *GGA* 160 (1898) p. 208; U. von Wilamowitz, *SPAW* 25 (1906) pp. 38f.; Phillipson, p. 147; Raeder 34; Tod 61 and pp. 135f.; C. D. Buck, *CPh* 8 (1913) p. 151; Lécrivain, pp.12–13; G. Corradi, *RFIC* 50 (1922) pp. 23–24; Meyer, *Grenzen*, pp. 29, 39; P. Jouguet, *Macedonian Imperialism*, trans. M. R. Dobie (London, 1928) p. 408; Tod, *Sidelights*, pp. 53f.; Holleaux, *Études*, vol. 1, p. 405; Magie, *RRAM*, vol. 1, p. 78; C. Roebuck, *CPh* 50 (1955) pp. 60–61; Ténékidès, p. 547; C. Habicht, *MDAI(A)* 72 (1957) pp. 167–69; Préaux, p. 250; Klose, pp. 144–45; W. Orth, *Königlicher Machtanspruch und städtische Freiheit* (Munich, 1977) p. 105; C. Préaux, *Le monde hellénistique* II (Paris, 1978) pp. 422–23; S. M. Burstein, *Ancient World* 3 (1980) p. 76; Bagnall/Derow 12; Burstein 12; S. M. Sherwin-White, *JHS* 105 (1985) p. 80; Shipley, pp. 31–37, 181–82, 266–68; Daverio Rocchi, pp. 170–77.

4. The terms γράψηται (line 17) and εἰcά[γειν]/εἰcαγό[ντων] seem to imply legal action (see Hicks, p. 25). It is also possible that Rhodes somehow became involved in the hostilities between Priene and Magnesia; see Ager, *Historia* 40 (1991) pp. 12–13.

5. See Sherwin-White, *JHS* 105, for a discussion of this Prienian archive. Cf. **74**, **100**, **160**.

I: Letter of Lysimachos to Samos (the inscription from Samos)

Βασιλεὺς Λυσίμαχος Σαμίων τῆι βουλῆι καὶ τῶι δήμωι χαίρειν·
[κα]τέστησαν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς οἵ τε πρέσβεις οἱ παρ' ὑμῶν καὶ οἱ παρὰ τῶν Πρ[ιη]-
νέων ἀποσταλέντες ὑπὲρ τῆς χώρας ἧς ἐτύγχανον ἡμ[φισ]-
βητηκότες πρ[ό]τερον ἐφ' ἡμῶν. εἰ μὲν οὖν προείδειμεν τὴν-
δε τὴν χώραν ὑμᾶς ἐκ [τ]οσούτων ἐτῶν ἔχειν καὶ νέμε[ι]ν κ[αθ']
ὅλον οὐκ ἂν ἐπεσπασάμεθα τὴν κρίσιν· νῦν δὲ ὑπελαμβάνομεν
ὑπογύου τινὸς χρόνου παντελῶς γεγονέναι τὴν ἐπέμβασιν·
[ο]ὕτω γὰρ ἡμῖν ἐποιοῦντο τὴν μνείαν ἐν τοῖς πρότερον λ[όγοις οἱ]
τῶν Πριηνέων πρέσβεις· οὐ μὴν ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ παρῆσαν οἵ τε παρ' ὑμῶ[ν]
[κ]αὶ οἱ παρὰ τῶν Πριηνέων, ἀναγκαῖον ἦν διακοῦσαι ἃ ἀπ[οδίδο]τα[ι παρ' ἑ]-
[κατέ]ρων. οἱ μὲν οὖν Πριηνεῖς τὴμ μὲν ἐξ ἀρχῆς γεγενημένην αὐ[τοῖς]
[κτῆσι]ν τῆς Βατινήτιδος χώρας ἐπεδείκνυον ἔκ τε τῶν ἱστοριῶ[ν καὶ]
[τῶν ἄ]λλων μαρτυριῶν καὶ δικαιωμάτων μ[ε]τὰ τῶν ἑξετῶν c[πον]δῶ[ν.]
[ὕστε]ρον δὲ συνωμολόγουν Λυγδάμεως ἐπελθόντος ἐπὶ τὴν Ἰω[νί]-
[αν μετὰ δ]υνάμεως τούς τε λοιποὺς ἐγλιπεῖν τὴν χώραν κ[αὶ Σαμ[ί]-
[ους εἰς τὴν ν]ῆσον ἀποχωρῆσαι· τὸν δὲ Λύγδα[μιν κ]ατασχόντα [τρί]α?
[ἔτη αὐτοῖς] πάλιν ἀποδιδόναι τὰς αὐτὰς κτήσεις τοὺς δὲ Πριη-
[νέας παρειληφέ]ναι, Σαμίων δὲ οὐθένα παραγενέσθαι παν[τε[λῶς τό]-
[τε πλὴν εἴ τις ἐ]τύγχανεν παρ' αὐτοῖς κατοικῶν· τοῦτον δὲ τ[ῶ]ν
[ἀγρῶν τὸ γινόμ]ενον προσενέγκασθαι Πριηνεῦσιν· ὕστερον δ[ὲ]
[ὑποστρέψαντας μετὰ β]ί[ας Σαμίους παρελέσθαι τὴν χώραν· ἀπ[ο]-
[σταλῆναι οὖν παρὰ τῶν] Πριηνέων Βίαντα περὶ διαλύσεων τοῖς Σα[μίοις αὐ]-
[τοκράτορα· τοῦτο]ν δὲ διαλῦσαί τε τὰς πόλεις καὶ τοὺς οἰκ[οῦντ]ας ἀ-
[ποχωρῆσαι τῆς Βα]τινήτιδος χώρας. πρότερομ μὲν οὖν ἔ[φασαν]
[τὰ πράγματα αὐτοῖς] μένειν ἐν τούτοις καὶ μέχρι τοῦ ἑσχάτου χρό-
[νου κρατεῖν τῆς χώρ]ας· νῦν δὲ ἠξίουν ἡμᾶς κατὰ τὴ[ν ἐ]ξ ἀρχῆς [κτῆ]-
[σιν ἀποδιδόναι αὐτοῖς] τὴν χώραν. οἱ δὲ παρ' ὑμῶν ἀποσταλέντες
[πρέσβεις τὴν κτῆσιν τὴ]ν γεγενημένην αὐτοῖς τῆς Βατινήτιδο[ς]
[χώρας ἔφασαν ἐκ προγόνων] παρειληφέναι. μετὰ δὲ τὴν Λυγδάμ[εως]
[εἰσβολὴν ἐγλιπεῖν συνωμο]λόγουν ὥσπερ καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ καὶ αὐτοὶ
[τὴν χώραν, ἀποχωρῆσαι δὲ εἰ]ς τὴν νῆσον· ὕστερον δὲ Ο. . . . .
. . . 20 . . . Ι . . οἰ[κε]ῖν χιλίους Σ[αμίους . . . . . .]

5: νέμε[c]θ[αι καθ']: Böckh, Hicks, Dittenberger, Hiller von Gaertringen. || 6: ὑπελαμβάνομεν [ἐξ]: Böckh, Hicks, Dittenberger, Hiller von Gaertringen. || 10: [λέγεται] π[αρ' ἔ-]: Böckh, Hicks, Dittenberger, Hiller von Gaertringen. || 13: Holleaux prefers τῶν μαρτυρίων with Wilamowitz (as from τὸ μαρτύριον), to Dittenberger and Hiller von Gaertringen's accentuation μαρτυριῶν (as from ἡ μαρτυρία, which Holleaux believes designates the deposition of a witness and is hence inappropriate here). Cf. *IPriene* 37.101 (**74**). || 18: [ὑποστρέψ]αι: Hiller von Gaertringen. [νέμεcθ]αι: Hicks, Dittenberger. παράπ[αν]: Böckh, Hicks, Dittenberger, Hiller von Gaertringen. || 20–21: ὑποστ[ρέψαν|τας δὲ ὕστερον]: Hiller von Gaertringen. || 21–22: α[ὐ]τῶν.| [πεμφθῆναι οὖν παρὰ]: Böckh, Hicks, Dittenberger, Hiller von Gaertringen. || 22–23: Σα[μίοις| πρεσβευτήν· τόν]: Hiller von Gaertringen.

II: Judgement of the Rhodian arbitrators in the 190s (the Prienian inscription)

ποτὶ δὲ τὸν Λυσίμαχον ἀ[ποστ]εῖλαι ὑπὲ[ρ τ]ο̣ῦ Βατινήτο[υ ἐπὶ στε]-
φαναφόρου τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ μετὰ Νίκανδρον, ὅς ἐστι ἀπὸ Λύκου πεντε[και]δέ-
κατος, καὶ ἀπὸ κήνου τοῦ χρόνου
ἐχόντων αὐτῶν καὶ τὸ φρούριον καὶ τᾶς χώρας τᾶς περὶ τὸ φρούριον [πε]πρα-
κότων κλάρους τεσσεράκοντα
καὶ δύο, οὐκ ἀγανακτῆσαι τοὺς Σαμίους οὐδ' ἀποστεῖλαι πὸτ αὐτοὺς π[ρ]ες-
βείαν ἐγκαλοῦντας ἐπὶ τοῖς διωι-
κημένοις, ἀλλὰ ἀμφισβασίας μὲν πὸθ αὐτοὺς ἰδιωτικὰς γεγόνειν? [π]αρορίας
τοὺς? ἐκ τοῦ Καρίου οὐκ ἀμφες-
βατήκειν τοὺς Σαμίους, ἀλλὰ τοὐναντίον ἐν τῶι ποτὶ Λυσίμαχον ἀ[ποστ]αλέντι
ψαφίσματι γεγράφθαι, διότι
Πριανεῖς ἔχοντι τὰν αὐτῶν χώραν·

Document I is a letter from Lysimachos to the Samians concerning the centuries-long territorial dispute that the latter had with Priene.[1] The land in question consisted of a strip just north of the mainland peninsula of Mykale that was claimed by Samos (the plain of Anaia). Priene also laid claim to the area, and to three districts specifically: the land called Batinetis, the fort called Karion, and the land around the fort, called Dryoussa.[2] The Batinetis formed the western part of the plain of Anaia, and the area called Dryoussa was located where the Batinetis became hilly to the west. This inscription mentions one of the earliest known incidents in the history of the territory, which was the invasion of Lygdamis and his subsequent "restoration" of the land to Priene alone, rather than to Samos and Priene, the two states that had occupied the region previously.[3] The Prienians claimed that Samos, with the aid of Miletos, later seized the land from them forcibly, and only as a result of the mediation of Bias did the Samian settlers leave the region and Priene receive it back. From that point on, the Prienian envoys say, until quite recently (μέχρι τοῦ ἐσχάτου χρόνου) the Batinetis had been theirs.

1. Cf. Piccirilli 4. The inscription cited in part above (*IPriene* 37) provides a date for the arbitration of Lysimachos: 283/2, very late in his reign.

2. The Batinetis ("the Brambles") is the only district mentioned by name in the third-century inscription (line 12); for the other regions, see **74**. See Shipley, pp. 33, 267; U. Fantasia, *Serta historica antiqua* (Rome, 1986) pp. 113–43.

3. Lines 14–20. The history of this particular piece of land goes back even farther, however, as we discover from *IPriene* 37.56 (see **74**). The land had once belonged to the small Carian state of Melia; when Melia was conquered around 700 B.C. by the combined forces of the Ionians, its land was divided between Samos and Priene. In the later arbitration of the Rhodians (lines 118f.), it was judged that at this very early date Priene had received Karion and Dryoussa, and Samos Phygela.

Nevertheless, at the time when the appeal for arbitration was made to Lysimachos, the Prienians were no longer in possession of the land. Perhaps they had been unsuccessful in retaining this territory when Alexander crossed into Asia; he may instead have awarded it to the Samians, though it does not seem likely.[4] Or they may have lost the land at some time between the reign of Alexander and that of Lysimachos. Apparently the Prienians were the first to approach the king and request the restoration of property that they claimed was rightfully theirs. Envoys from both cities were invited to state their claims (the Prienians for the second time) in a formal setting. What the final judgement was is impossible to say for certain, as the inscription breaks off. It is probable, however, that the Batinetis was awarded to Samos.[5] The tone adopted by Lysimachos at the start of the letter, where he in effect apologizes to the Samians for having listened to the case of Priene at all (εἰ μὲν οὖν προείδειμεν . . . οὐκ ἂν ἐπεσπασάμεθα τὴγ κρίσιν), indicates that he must have believed the Samians to have the prior claim. If he thought their claim strong enough that he would not even have convoked a court had he known of it, it seems most unlikely that he would have awarded the land on this occasion to Priene. There is also the supporting, though not conclusive, evidence of the provenance of the inscription. The fact that it was published at Samos leads one to conclude that the judgement was favourable to that state.[6]

There is no evidence for any subsequent arbitration involving the entire Batinetis; as far as the territory as a whole was concerned, this judgement of Lysimachos was apparently final. The Rhodian arbitration from the first part of the second century (**74**) appears to be concerned with only a part of the Batinetis, the fort called Karion and the area called Dryoussa.[7] The Rhodian court awarded these possessions to Priene; Manlius Vulso gave them to Samos shortly thereafter in a decision that was reversed some fifty years later by the Roman senate (**99**, **160**). Nevertheless, it seems that even in the early third century Samos did not in fact receive *all* the land in question. In the evidence

4. Lines 146–47 of *IPriene* 37 indicate that Alexander may have ruled on the issue of Samos and Priene when he was in Asia. Alexander's name appears in the context of evidence adduced by the Prienians before the Rhodian tribunal, which might imply that Alexander had awarded the land to Priene.

5. That the land went to Samos is agreed by most scholars (Böckh, Dittenberger, Hiller von Gaertringen, Lenschau, Röhl, Welles, Wilamowitz); that it went to Priene was claimed by Hicks and Berard (although the latter admits the difficulty of saying for certain, given the condition of the stone).

6. The only documents found at Priene regarding the conflict with Samos are those that were favourable to Priene: the Rhodian judgement (**74**) and the later *senatus consulta* (**160**); the judgement of Lysimachos appears nowhere at Priene, nor is there any *contemporary* evidence at Priene for the judgement of Manlius Vulso (**99**).

7. *IPriene* 37.9, 26. Karion and Dryoussa as part of the Batinetis: see Dittenberger, *OGIS*, pp. 39, 40, 43; id., *SIG*^{3} 688, n. 4 (**160**); Piccirilli, pp. 19–20.

adduced before the Rhodian court a century later, Priene claimed to have held the possessions then in dispute (i.e., Karion and Dryoussa) ever since the decision of Lysimachos. If this later Prienian claim is to be believed, Samos admitted in its depositions to Lysimachos that Karion belonged to Priene.[8] Presumably, then, in the early third century, Samos was allowed to retain the majority of the coastal plain, while Priene was conceded the strategic fort and the land immediately surrounding it.

This inscription, when viewed together with the later ones dealing with the dispute between Samos and Priene, reveals something of the kind of evidence that might be offered in an arbitral court. The envoys from Priene offer proof of their claim ἔκ τε τῶν ἱστοριῶ[ν καὶ τῶν ἄ]λλων μαρτυριῶν καὶ δικαιωμάτων μ̣[ε]τὰ τῶν ἐξετῶν c[πον]δῶ[ν].[9] The reference to written histories to prove the priority of one's claims is borne out by the lengthier inscription (*IPriene* 37) recording the Rhodian arbitration. There the names of the historians and a summary of their supporting evidence are given. Most of the historians cited in the later inscription, some of whom may also have been cited here (since Karion and Dryoussa formed part of the Batinetis), assigned the fort to Priene at an early date. The incident under discussion by the historians listed in *IPriene* 37 was the allotment of the lands after the Ionian war against Melia. Priority of possession, or at least duration of possession, was clearly a factor in arbitral judgements, as the attempts of both sides to establish their own claims in this inscription show. Samos apparently did not dispute here Priene's claim to original possession, but Priene definitely disputed Samos's claim to a lengthy occupation lasting up until the moment of Lysimachos's arbitration. This may explain why in 283/2, in an arbitration whose outcome seems to have been generally favourable to Samos, this section of the Batinetis was given to Priene.

This is one of the very few cases in which it is possible to see the personal presence of a Hellenistic monarch himself in an arbitration.[10] While it is always tempting to read into the arbitration of a monarch an exercise of personal power, in this case Lysimachos does seem to have been a neutral arbitrator. There is evidence of good relations between Lysimachos and Priene at this time, yet he does not appear to have favoured Priene in his court.[11]

8. *IPriene* 37.130. See also Hicks, *BMus*, vol. III.1, p. 4.

9. The six years' truce, which provided some information, dated back to the sixth-century war; the δικαιώματα may simply be a general term for the official documents that the Prienians entered in pleading their case, or may have represented actual evidence from earlier tribunals (Wilamowitz, p. 43 n. 5). See Welles, p. 49 and App. s.v. δικαίωμα.

10. Shipley (pp. 181–82) suggests that Lysimachos's willingness to carry out this arbitration was a belated attempt, in the aftermath of his son's murder, to better his poor public image with the Greek city-states of Asia generally.

11. See *OGIS* 11, a decree of a grateful Priene honouring Lysimachos.

27. Pyrrhos offers to resolve the conflict between Rome and the Italian Greeks (280)

I: Dionysios of Halikarnassos 19.9.2–4.
II: Plutarch *Pyrrhos* 16.4.
III: Zonaras 8.3.4.

Sonne 16; de Ruggiero, p. 65; Berard 27; Matthaei, *CQ*, p. 254; E. Bickerman, *CPh* 42 (1947) pp. 137–46; P. Lévêque, *Pyrrhos* (Paris, 1957) pp. 319–21; Schmitt 467; P. Garoufalias, *Pyrrhus, King of Epirus* (London, 1979) pp. 70–71, 336; Will, vol. 1, pp. 120f.; Gruen, p. 100; G. C. Brauer, *Taras: Its History and Coinage* (New York, 1986) pp. 141–42; H. Sonnabend, *Chiron* 19 (1989) pp. 333–34.

I: Dionysios of Halikarnassos 19.9.2–4

"Συμβουλεύω τέ σοι, περὶ ὧν ὁ Ῥωμαίων δῆμος διαφέρεται πρὸς Ταραντίνους ἢ Λευκανοὺς ἢ Σαυνίτας ἐμοὶ τὴν διάγνωσιν ἐπιτρέπειν—διαιτήσω γὰρ ἀπὸ παντὸς τοῦ δικαίου τὰ διάφορα—καὶ παρέξω τοὺς ἐμαυτοῦ φίλους ἅπασας τὰς βλάβας ἀποτίνοντας, ἃς ἂν αὐτῶν ἐγὼ καταγνῶ. (3) ὀρθῶς δὲ ποιήσετε καὶ ὑμεῖς βεβαιωτὰς παρασχόντες ὑπὲρ ὧν ἂν ἐκείνων τινὲς ἐπικαλῶσιν, ὅτι τὰ κριθέντα ὑπ' ἐμοῦ φυλάξετε κύρια. ταῦτα ποιοῦσι μὲν ὑμῖν εἰρήνην ἐπαγγέλλομαι παρέξειν καὶ φίλος ἔσεσθαι καὶ ἐφ' οὓς ἄν με παρακαλῆτε πολέμους προθύμως βοηθήσειν· (4) μὴ ποιοῦσι δ' οὐκ ἂν ἐπιτρέψαιμι χώραν συμμάχων ἀνδρῶν ἐξερημοῦν καὶ πόλεις Ἑλληνίδας ἀναρπάζειν καὶ σώματα ἐλεύθερα λαφυροπωλεῖν, ἀλλὰ κωλύσω τοῖς ὅπλοις, ἵνα παύσησθε ἤδη ποτὲ ἄγοντες καὶ φέροντες ὅλην Ἰταλίαν καὶ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ὡς δούλοις ἐντρυφῶντες. ἐκδέξομαι δὲ τὰς σὰς ἀποκρίσεις μέχρι δεκάτης ἡμέρας· περαιτέρω γὰρ οὐκ ἂν ἔτι δυναίμην."

II: Plutarch *Pyrrhos* 16.4

[Ὁ Πύρρος] ... ἐξῆλθε μετὰ τῆς δυνάμεως, προπέμψας κήρυκα πρὸς τοὺς Ῥωμαίους, εἰ φίλον ἐστὶν αὐτοῖς πρὸ πολέμου δίκας λαβεῖν παρὰ τῶν Ἰταλιωτῶν, αὐτῷ δικαστῇ καὶ διαλλακτῇ χρησαμένους.

III: Zonaras 8.3.4

"Δικάσω γὰρ ὑμῖν ἐγὼ εἴ τι ἀλλήλοις ἐγκαλεῖτε, καὶ ἄκοντας τὰ δίκαια ποιεῖν ἀναγκάσω."

These literary texts tell of a message that Pyrrhos of Epiros purportedly sent to the Roman consul Laevinus prior to the battle of Herakleia, which Pyrrhos and his Tarentine allies fought against the Romans in the summer of 280. Both Dionysios of Halikarnassos and Zonaras (Dio Cassius) report that this message was contained in a letter to Laevinus, a letter that Dionysios claims to be quoting. The message was an offer to arbitrate between Rome and Pyrrhos's Greek ally,

Tarentum. The Tarentines had invited Pyrrhos into Italy so that he could aid them, in the capacity of a hegemon, in their struggle with Rome. According to Dionysios, Pyrrhos rather arrogantly advised Laevinus to submit the Roman disputes with Tarentum, the Leucanians, and the Samnites to him for resolution. Pyrrhos promised to arbitrate with strict justice and to ensure that his friends would pay whatever amends he judged. He suggested that the Romans on their part should offer securities to guarantee that his settlement would be adhered to. In return for a positive response to his suggestion of arbitration, he offered peace and alliance with himself. If the Romans should refuse his offer, then the threat of coercion is implicit in Pyrrhos's assertion that he would not allow Rome to harm his allies. Zonaras also records that Pyrrhos was prepared to force justice on unwilling participants.

Plutarch, rather than quoting a dubious letter, states that the contents of the message that Pyrrhos sent to the consul were conveyed indirectly by means of a herald. He also records a less precise, and in many ways more believable, message.[1] He states simply that Pyrrhos, hearing of the approach of the consular army, marched out with his troops but sent a herald ahead. The herald conveyed to the Roman consul Pyrrhos's offer to act as δικαστὴς καὶ διαλλακτής, provided that the Romans would be interested in arbitration.[2] The tone of the offer is much less arrogant than the one recorded by Dionysios.

The letter to Laevinus and offer of arbitration have, with a few exceptions, been presumed to be apocryphal.[3] Nevertheless, there are certain arguments in favour of accepting as historical the facts that lie behind the letter if not the letter itself. The most extensive examination of the passage in Dionysios is that of Bickerman, who argued that the anachronistic and nonidiomatic Greek of the letter headings indicated a date in the mid–second century B.C. for its original composition, and a Roman author forging it in Greek. The best candidate for the position of the Roman author, Bickerman believed, was C. Acilius, the Roman senator and annalist.[4] Based on the similarities in the letter to certain aspects of Greek (not Roman) arbitration, which a Roman annalist might be unlikely to invent, Bickerman argued that Acilius constituted his forgery from historical fact, and that an offer of arbitration was actually made.

1. Bickerman (p. 141) suggests that Plutarch as well as Dio (and Zonaras) used the letters of Pyrrhos and Laevinus as given by Dionysios; however, the fact that Plutarch does not quote a letter as such but rather states that Pyrrhos conveyed his offer by means of a herald suggests that he may have had some independent source.

2. Appian's words μήτε Ῥωμαίοις δικαστὴν ἢ διαιτητήν (*Sam.* 10.2) may reflect this initial offer; at the point where Appian inserts them (in the speech of Appius Claudius Caecus, *after* Herakleia, when Pyrrhos was attempting to conclude a peace treaty) the reference to Pyrrhos's pretensions to be a judge or arbitrator is less appropriate.

3. See Lévêque, pp. 319–21; and Garoufalias, pp. 336–37 n. 84.

4. Bickerman, pp. 140–41; Schmitt, p. 108.

Rome did not accept Pyrrhos's offer of arbitration, which is scarcely surprising, given the origin and general context of this overture. Even if Pyrrhos himself believed that he could pose as a neutral judge when he was allied to one of the belligerents, it is unlikely that Rome could accept him as such. Nor were the Romans in the habit of submitting to arbitration. Bickerman claimed that Pyrrhos's offer was sincere and sprang from his original agreement with the Tarentines, to help them settle their differences with Rome. But while it is perhaps too much to say, with Lévêque, that Pyrrhos's "warlike character" would never have allowed him to attempt arbitration, it is surely naïve to claim that Pyrrhos's ambitions were limited only to aiding Tarentum, or that an attempt to arbitrate would have been an ordinary first step at this juncture. It seems, rather, that Pyrrhos's essay in negotiating a settlement between the Romans and the Tarentines was a result of the unexpected military circumstances in which he found himself on his arrival in Italy. A large part of his force had been lost in crossing the Ionian Sea, the Tarentines had turned out to be apathetic allies, and the other Italian allies did not arrive in time for the battle of Herakleia.[5] Pyrrhos did win the battle that was eventually fought, but at the cost of a large number of his best men. It would not be remarkable if he had attempted, under the circumstances, to negotiate rather than fight. Since he had not yet declared himself an open enemy of Rome, he might still have had hopes of taking on the role of an arbitrator who had come to settle the dispute between the Italian Greeks and Rome.[6]

28. A judgement between two unknown states by Dorian arbitrators (c. 280?)

Fragment of a marble stele discovered at Delphi. H: 0.155 m; w: 0.10 m; d: 0.06 m.

Pomtow, *Klio* 18 (1923) p. 264, no. 202; *Crönert, *SEG* II.259.

- - - - - - - - -αχος- - - - -
[- - - - - - ἐκ]ατέρα ᾗ [πόλις - - - - -]
[- - - - δικαστ]αῖς ἐξήκον[τα καὶ ἑνί?- -]
[- - - - - κα]ταθέντω εἰς τ[ὸ δικαστήριον?- -]
[- - - - - κ]αὶ ἄλλαν ἀσφρᾷ[γιστον - - -]
[- - - - - κ]αὶ ἀποτεισάτω ἑκα[τέρα ἃ πόλις - -]
[οἱ δὲ ταμίαι] πραξάντω καὶ κατ[αχωριζόντω εἰς τὸ ἱερόν]
vacat

5. Plut. *Pyrrh.* 15–17. See Lévêque, pp. 318, 321; Will, vol. 1, p. 124; Brauer, pp. 141–42.

6. Garoufalias (p. 337) suggests that, if all else failed, Pyrrhos's offer of arbitration would at least have had the effect of making the Romans appear as "irreconcilable imperialists." For a discussion of the ethical notions and propaganda that could be attached to the phenomenon of arbitration, see **8**.

Rome did not accept Pyrrhos's offer of arbitration, which is scarcely surprising, given the origin and general context of this overture. Even if Pyrrhos himself believed that he could pose as a neutral judge when he was allied to one of the belligerents, it is unlikely that Rome could accept him as such. Nor were the Romans in the habit of submitting to arbitration. Bickerman claimed that Pyrrhos's offer was sincere and sprang from his original agreement with the Tarentines, to help them settle their differences with Rome. But while it is perhaps too much to say, with Lévêque, that Pyrrhos's "warlike character" would never have allowed him to attempt arbitration, it is surely naïve to claim that Pyrrhos's ambitions were limited only to aiding Tarentum, or that an attempt to arbitrate would have been an ordinary first step at this juncture. It seems, rather, that Pyrrhos's essay in negotiating a settlement between the Romans and the Tarentines was a result of the unexpected military circumstances in which he found himself on his arrival in Italy. A large part of his force had been lost in crossing the Ionian Sea, the Tarentines had turned out to be apathetic allies, and the other Italian allies did not arrive in time for the battle of Herakleia.[5] Pyrrhos did win the battle that was eventually fought, but at the cost of a large number of his best men. It would not be remarkable if he had attempted, under the circumstances, to negotiate rather than fight. Since he had not yet declared himself an open enemy of Rome, he might still have had hopes of taking on the role of an arbitrator who had come to settle the dispute between the Italian Greeks and Rome.[6]

28. A judgement between two unknown states by Dorian arbitrators (c. 280?)

Fragment of a marble stele discovered at Delphi. H: 0.155 m; w: 0.10 m; d: 0.06 m.

Pomtow, *Klio* 18 (1923) p. 264, no. 202; *Crönert, *SEG* II.259.

- - - - - - - - -αχος- - - - -
[- - - - - - ἐκ]ατέρα ᾗ [πόλις - - - - -]
[- - - - δικαστ]αῖς ἐξήκον[τα καὶ ἑνί?- -]
[- - - - - κα]ταθέντω εἰς τ[ὸ δικαστήριον?- -]
[- - - - - κ]αὶ ἄλλαν ἀσφρᾷ[γιστον - - -]
[- - - - - κ]αὶ ἀποτεισάτω ἑκα[τέρα ἃ πόλις - -]
[οἱ δὲ ταμίαι] πραξάντω καὶ κατ[αχωριζόντω εἰς τὸ ἱερόν]
vacat

5. Plut. *Pyrrh.* 15–17. See Lévêque, pp. 318, 321; Will, vol. 1, p. 124; Brauer, pp. 141–42.

6. Garoufalias (p. 337) suggests that, if all else failed, Pyrrhos's offer of arbitration would at least have had the effect of making the Romans appear as "irreconcilable imperialists." For a discussion of the ethical notions and propaganda that could be attached to the phenomenon of arbitration, see **8**.

7: supplied by Crönert. πραξάντω καὶ κατ[α]: Pomtow.

So little is left of this inscription that only a tentative claim can be made for it being a case of arbitration. Pomtow, the first editor, thought it to be so largely on the basis of the judges perhaps mentioned in line 3.[1] This assumption may be borne out by the references to ἑκατέρα ἁ πόλις, and possibly to deposition (of pleas or testimony?) in a law court. The phrase καταθέντω εἰς τὸ δικαστήριον may refer to the deposition of documents relative to the case, although it must be remembered that δικαστήριον is restored. Perhaps line 5, καὶ ἄλλαν ἀσφράγιστον, is a partial reference to whatever documents were meant. The terms ἀντιγραφή, a plea, or ἐκμαρτυρία, the deposition of a witness taken out of court, may be what is missing here. These suggestions come from another case of arbitration, the detailed inscription documenting the dispute between Kalymna and Kos that was arbitrated by Knidos (**21**). That inscription refers to the deposition of pleas and evidence, and the taking of written testimony beforehand (as opposed to the physical presence of a witness in court).[2] This testimony was to be provided to the other state in copies both sealed and unsealed. References to sealed and unsealed testimony may also be present in the document cited here (line 5). Sealed written testimony had the same legal validity as the sworn oral testimony from which it was taken; unsealed testimony did not and was meant to be distributed for informational purposes only.[3] There was also apparently a fine to be paid, or perhaps a security to ensure compliance with the court's decision.[4]

1. He based both his decision to restore [δικαστ]αῖς or [χριτ]αῖς here rather than [ἐν ἁμέρ]αις and his consequent surmise that this was a case of international arbitration on the large number given in this line (sixty, or perhaps sixty-one, to ensure an odd number; cf. the sixty-one Athenian judges in the dispute between Thronion and Skarphai [**167**]); but the initial assumption (the high number ruling out the restoration [ἐν ἁμέρ]αις) is unwarranted.

The use of the Doric dialect indicates the ethnic character of the state that promulgated this decree. Pomtow dated the inscription to the mid–third century, based on the similarity of its lettering to that of the Delphi-Pellana σύμβολα (*FDelphes* III.1.486); with the recent backdating of that treaty to c. 285–280 (S. Cataldi, *ASNP* 1977, 2, pp. 458–573), it is possible that this arbitration fragment should also be dated to the earlier period.

2. Case **21**, A, lines 33–39, 56–60.

3. *RIJG* I, p. 174.

4. Crönert's restoration of line 7 would mean that the finance officials would exact whatever fine was set down, and register or deposit it in the temple (εἰς τὸ ἱερόν), perhaps acting as a kind of public bank. The *tamiai* would be officials of the arbitrating city, and it may be that the amount of money was meant here not as a fine for noncompliance, as in **47**, **48**, **83**, but rather as security to ensure compliance, as in the much later arbitration of Knossos between Lato and Olos (**164**); this would fit better with Crönert's suggestion regarding the temple.

29. Kleonymos of Sparta oversees a treaty between Phalasarna and Polyrhenia (before 273)

Stele discovered in the ruins of the Diktynnaion on the peninsula of Tityros in west Crete. H: 0.98 m; w: 0.555 m; d: 0.135 m.

*Guarducci, *IC* II.xi, pp. 131–33, no. 1; Schmitt 471; D. Gondicas, *Recherches sur la Crète occidentale* (Amsterdam, 1988) vol. 2, no. 78.

G. de Sanctis, *MonAL* 11 (1901) pp. 494–96; G. Cardinali, *RSA* 9 (1904) pp. 70f.; van Effenterre, pp. 203, 248; R. Willetts, *Aristocratic Society in Ancient Crete* (London, 1955) p. 235; id., *Ancient Crete* (London and Toronto 1965) pp. 152–53; E. Mikrogiannakes, Ἡ Κρήτη κατὰ τοὺς ἑλληνιστικοὺς χρόνους (Athens, 1967) p. 46; *SEG* XXV.1027; Gondicas, *Recherches,* vol. 1, pp. 125–26, 223–24, 290–92, 314; id., *Cretan Studies* 2 (Amsterdam, 1990) pp. 139–45.

Θεοί

[τάδε συ]νέθεντο Πολυρήνιοι καὶ Φαλασάρνιοι ἐναντίον Κλεωνύμου [καὶ]
[τῶν ἄλλ]ων Λακεδαιμονίων οὓς ἀπέστειλεν . ο . . αις ὁ δᾶμος ιτ . . . . .
[. . . . ι]ς φίλον καὶ ἐχθρὸν τὸν αὐτὸν ἥμεν ἀπο- - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - - - -ν καὶ - - - - - τὰν αὐτῶν . κατ .
- - - - - κατὰ - - - - - - - - - - - - - -δαν ἐκ τῶν .
- - - - - - - - - - τῶν Πολυρηνίων καὶ παργένωνται με . .
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -εν . . Φαλασάρνιοι τῶν . . .

2: ἐναντί[α]: de Sanctis. || 3: [x]ο[ιν]αῖς?: Guarducci. || 3–4: Ἰτ[αλιωτ- -]?: Guarducci. || 5: EKAT: de Sanctis. ἑκατ[ερο- -]?: Guarducci.

This fragmented inscription from a sanctuary of Artemis Diktynna in western Crete is a record of a treaty between Phalasarna and Polyrhenia, two states often hostile to one another.[1] The agreement is said to have been made "in the presence of" Kleonymos and the other Lakedaimonians sent by the people (of Sparta). The two states involved may have requested an embassy that could arbitrate a treaty between them, although it is possible that Sparta took the initiative in seeking out the role of mediator, since Sparta seems to have had an extensive interest in Cretan affairs in this period.[2] At any rate, Sparta's involvement in Crete at this time would have made it a natural choice as arbitrator.

The Kleonymos who was sent to Polyrhenia and Phalasarna was undoubtedly the younger son of Kleomenes II, the Kleonymos who in 273 attempted a coup at Sparta with the aid of Pyrrhos. Since the embassy mentioned in this inscription

1. See Gondicas, *Cretan Studies,* p. 140.

2. For an earlier Cretan treaty concluded with the aid of a third party from the Greek mainland, see Piccirilli 18, 19 (Knossos and Tylissos/Argos).

was clearly an official one sent by the Spartan people, and since Kleonymos was a part of it, it must predate Kleonymos's exile and attempted coup. Guarducci argued in favour of the possibility that the letters IT- at the end of line 3 indicate a possible reference to Kleonymos's expedition to Italy in 304 to aid the Tarentines. In her view, Kleonymos would have gone first to Crete, perhaps in order to augment his mercenary force before heading to Tarentum; while there he would have ordered the affairs of Polyrhenia and Phalasarna. Guarducci's reconstruction of events does not, however, appear to be feasible. Kleonymos is said to have gone to Italy without delay (cυντόμως, Diod. 20.104.2); and the lettering of the decree may also be too late to suit the end of the fourth century.[3] Furthermore, the diplomatic intervention of Sparta in Crete accords better with the events of a somewhat later period.[4]

30. Judges from Kassandreia arbitrate the borders of Melitaia, Chalai, and Peuma (c. 270–260?)

A marble stele discovered at the temple of Apollo in Delphi; the inscription contains information pertinent to this case and the following one (**31**). H: 0.77 m; w: 0.39 m (top), 0.44 m (bottom); d: 0.12 m.

M. Laurent, *BCH* 25 (1901) pp. 337–44, no. 1; Kern, *IG* IX.2 *add.* p. xi, no. 205 II; Schwyzer 555; J. Bousquet, *BCH* 82 (1958) pp. 67–69; *SEG* XVIII.238 (after Bousquet); *Pouilloux, *FDelphes* III.4, 4.351; Daverio Rocchi 13.1.

Raeder 36; Tod 38; F. Stählin, *MDAI(A)* 39 (1914) pp. 85f.; H. Pomtow, *Klio* 18 (1923) pp. 260–61; Stählin, pp. 162–70; G. Daux, *BCH* 63 (1939) pp. 158–59; Robert, *REG* 1942, 83; G. Daux, *BCH* 103 (1979) p. 472; H. Reinder Reinders, *New Halos* (Utrecht, 1988) pp. 173–75; Daverio Rocchi, pp. 143–51; Ager, *AHB* 3.5 (1989) pp. 107–14.

[Ἀρχόν]τ̣ων Ξένωνος Πολυcαωνείου, Κυνίcκου
- - -οκείου, Ἀγάνορος Νικοβουλείου· ἀγαθῆι
[τύχηι· τ]άδε ἔκριναν οἱ δικαcταὶ ἐκ Καccαν-
[δρείας] Πραξικλῆς Κλέωνος, Θεόδωρος Ἀριcτο-
- - - Ζ̣αλίας Cατύρου, Ἀρχέcτρατος Παρμενίc-
[κου, Τι]μάνθης Πολυζήλου, ὑπὲρ τῆς χώρας ἧς
[ἀμφέ]λεγον πρὸς ἀλλήλους Μελιταιεῖc καὶ Χαλαῖ-
[οι πρὸς] Πευματίους· ἐκρίναμεν εἶναι τὴν χώ-

3. Van Effenterre, p. 203.

4. See de Sanctis, p. 495; van Effenterre, pp. 203, 248; Schmitt, p. 117; Gondicas, *Recherches*, vol. 1, pp. 85, 125, 223–24, 314f.

was clearly an official one sent by the Spartan people, and since Kleonymos was a part of it, it must predate Kleonymos's exile and attempted coup. Guarducci argued in favour of the possibility that the letters IT- at the end of line 3 indicate a possible reference to Kleonymos's expedition to Italy in 304 to aid the Tarentines. In her view, Kleonymos would have gone first to Crete, perhaps in order to augment his mercenary force before heading to Tarentum; while there he would have ordered the affairs of Polyrhenia and Phalasarna. Guarducci's reconstruction of events does not, however, appear to be feasible. Kleonymos is said to have gone to Italy without delay (cυντόμως, Diod. 20.104.2); and the lettering of the decree may also be too late to suit the end of the fourth century.[3] Furthermore, the diplomatic intervention of Sparta in Crete accords better with the events of a somewhat later period.[4]

30. Judges from Kassandreia arbitrate the borders of Melitaia, Chalai, and Peuma (c. 270–260?)

A marble stele discovered at the temple of Apollo in Delphi; the inscription contains information pertinent to this case and the following one (**31**). H: 0.77 m; w: 0.39 m (top), 0.44 m (bottom); d: 0.12 m.

M. Laurent, *BCH* 25 (1901) pp. 337–44, no. 1; Kern, *IG* IX.2 *add.* p. xi, no. 205 II; Schwyzer 555; J. Bousquet, *BCH* 82 (1958) pp. 67–69; *SEG* XVIII.238 (after Bousquet); *Pouilloux, *FDelphes* III.4, 4.351; Daverio Rocchi 13.1.

Raeder 36; Tod 38; F. Stählin, *MDAI(A)* 39 (1914) pp. 85f.; H. Pomtow, *Klio* 18 (1923) pp. 260–61; Stählin, pp. 162–70; G. Daux, *BCH* 63 (1939) pp. 158–59; Robert, *REG* 1942, 83; G. Daux, *BCH* 103 (1979) p. 472; H. Reinder Reinders, *New Halos* (Utrecht, 1988) pp. 173–75; Daverio Rocchi, pp. 143–51; Ager, *AHB* 3.5 (1989) pp. 107–14.

[Ἀρχόν]τ̣ων Ξένωνος Πολυcαωνείου, Κυνίcκου
- - -οκείου, Ἀγάνορος Νικοβουλείου· ἀγαθῆι
[τύχηι· τ]άδε ἔκριναν οἱ δικαcταὶ ἐκ Καccαν-
[δρείας] Πραξικλῆς Κλέωνος, Θεόδωρος Ἀριcτο-
- - - Ζ̣αλίας Cατύρου, Ἀρχέcτρατος Παρμενίc-
[κου, Τι]μάνθης Πολυζήλου, ὑπὲρ τῆς χώρας ἧς
[ἀμφέ]λεγον πρὸς ἀλλήλους Μελιταιεῖc καὶ Χαλαῖ-
[οι πρὸς] Πευματίους· ἐκρίναμεν εἶναι τὴν χώ-

3. Van Effenterre, p. 203.

4. See de Sanctis, p. 495; van Effenterre, pp. 203, 248; Schmitt, p. 117; Gondicas, *Recherches*, vol. 1, pp. 85, 125, 223–24, 314f.

[ραν Μ]ελιταιέων καὶ Χαλαίων ἦν περιήγαγον
[ἡμᾶς] Μελιταιεῖς καὶ Χαλαῖοι· ἀπὸ Γραίας Αὐλᾶς
[ἐπὶ τὸ]ν Κυρσιλίδα τόπον, ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρσιλίδα ἐπὶ τὸ
[πρός]θεν καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ ὅριον καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὁρίου ἐπὶ τὸ Βορ-
[ρᾶ ἱερ]ὸν, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἐπὶ τὸ Μακύριον καὶ ἀπὸ
[τοῦ Μ]ακυρίου ἐπὶ τὰ Δικόρυφα καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν Δικο-
[ρύφων] ἐπὶ τὸ Μεσοράκτιον καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ Μεσορακτί-
[ου ἐπ]ὶ τὸν Σπονδὸν [vac]

1: [ταγ]ῶν: Laurent, Kern, Schwyzer. [ἀρχόντ]ων: Bousquet. || 2: Ἀγάνορος Κλεοβουλείου: Laurent, Schwyzer; omitted by Kern. Νικοβουλείου: Bousquet. || 2–3: Ἀγαθῆ| [τύχη]: Laurent. || 3–4: Καccαν|[δρίας]: Laurent. || 4: Πραξιτέλης: Laurent, Kern, Schwyzer, Daux. Πραξικλῆς: Bousquet. || 4–5: Ἀριστο|[e.g. φύλου], Ζαλίας: Daux, Bousquet. || 5: [. . . .]αλίας: Laurent, Kern, Schwyzer. || 6: [κου], Μάνθης: Laurent. Ἄνθης: Kern (following Hiller von Gaertringen), Schwyzer. [Τι]μάνθης: Daux, Bousquet. || 12–13: Βορ|[έου]: Laurent.

This inscription records the results of two boundary arbitrations between several small states in Achaia Phthiotis. The first (lines 6–16, cited here) dealt with a dispute between Peuma (Peumata) on one side and Melitaia and Chalai on the other. The second (lines 16–30 [**31**]) was between Peuma, again, and the two towns of Pereia and Phylladon. In both cases Peuma lost. The judges of both disputes were five citizens from the Macedonian city of Kassandreia. The inscription also names twelve witnesses, nine of whom were from Phthiotic Thebes, and three from Demetrias. In the arbitration between Peuma and Melitaia-Chalai, the judges decided that the disputed territory was to go to Melitaia and Chalai together. If this and the following case are indicative of competition between Melitaia and Peuma, then perhaps Chalai had turned to Melitaia for support in a struggle that really concerned land between Peuma and Chalai. The Melitaians and Chalaians had escorted the judges over the land prior to the final decision.[1] While the arbitrators apparently assigned the disputed land in its entirety to the one side, nevertheless a border demarcation had to be carried out to ensure that there would be no further conflict over details. This boundary demarcation begins from the same point as the one in the following case; in the present case we are dealing with the area east of the starting point, whereas the following case is concerned with the area west of this point.[2]

1. Peumatan representatives are conspicuously absent here, as they are in the following judgement. It is difficult to believe that in a truly objective arbitration the envoys from one side or the other would be prevented from escorting the arbitrators over the territory concerned. Perhaps the judges did indeed examine the land in the company of the Peumatans; but the winning side would not necessarily record that fact in an inscription.

2. The starting point of both demarcations appears in line 10 (ἀπὸ Γραίας Αὐλᾶς) and again in lines 20–21 (ἀπὸ τῆς καλουμένης Γραίας| [Αὐλ]ῆς).

The phrasing of lines 7–8 of this inscription (ἧς| [ἀμφέ]λεγον πρὸς ἀλλήλους Μελιταιεῖς καὶ Χαλαῖ|[οι πρὸς] Πευματίους), and the curious fact of having two separate states on one side of a land arbitration, led the first editor to think that the Melitaians and Chalaians also disputed the land between themselves.[3] This explanation, however, seems to make awkward phrasing still more awkward and obscure. If Melitaia and Chalai had in fact reconciled for the purpose of presenting a united front against Peuma, then it seems unlikely that the fact of their disagreement would receive notice in an arbitration procedure by judges to whom they would have refused to submit this alleged dispute. It may be that Melitaia and Chalai had some agreement whereby they made joint use of certain lands.[4]

The dating of this inscription relies heavily on the letterforms; traditional interpretation of them has placed this arbitration late in the first half of the third century. In addition we are provided with a terminus post quem of c. 290 in the founding of Demetrias, the provenance of some of the witnesses; and a possible terminus ante quem of about 260/59 in the inclusion of Achaia Phthiotis, or at least Melitaia, in the Aitolian League. There is no mention of the Aitolian League in our inscription, and in fact it is the Macedonian influence that appears here, via Kassandreia and Demetrias. Hence a date of around 270–260 would place this arbitration during the years when Melitaia was still connected to the Macedonian power and before it had become a member of the Aitolian League.[5]

31. Judges from Kassandreia arbitrate the borders of Pereia, Phylladon, and Peuma (c. 270–260?)

The same inscription as **30**.

Raeder 35. For further bibliography see the citations in **30**.

3. Laurent, p. 340. In cases of arbitration we might expect ἀμφέλεγον πρὸς ἀλλήλους with the names of the disputants in the nominative; but here that is the position of the names of Melitaia and Chalai, while the name of the Peumatans is reserved for the next clause, πρὸς Πευματίους. Either this second phrase, πρὸς Πευματίους, explicates the first, πρὸς ἀλλήλους, or we have to understand that the Melitaians and Chalaians disputed the land between themselves and were only reconciled for the purpose of making sure that Peuma did not get it. Cf. Tod's criticism of Laurent's view.

4. Cf. the mutual use of a commonly held piece of ground in the agreement between Messene and Phigaleia (**40**).

5. See Laurent, p. 343; Daux, *BCH* 63, p. 158; Bousquet, p. 67. Cf. **32**, an arbitration carried out for Melitaia by a Macedonian functionary, perhaps also around 270–260. Melitaia also benefitted from arbitral judgements made in its favour once it joined the Aitolian League (**55**, **56**).

The phrasing of lines 7–8 of this inscription (ἧς| [ἀμφέ]λεγον πρὸς ἀλλήλους Μελιταιεῖς καὶ Χαλαῖ|[οι πρὸς] Πευματίους), and the curious fact of having two separate states on one side of a land arbitration, led the first editor to think that the Melitaians and Chalaians also disputed the land between themselves.[3] This explanation, however, seems to make awkward phrasing still more awkward and obscure. If Melitaia and Chalai had in fact reconciled for the purpose of presenting a united front against Peuma, then it seems unlikely that the fact of their disagreement would receive notice in an arbitration procedure by judges to whom they would have refused to submit this alleged dispute. It may be that Melitaia and Chalai had some agreement whereby they made joint use of certain lands.[4]

The dating of this inscription relies heavily on the letterforms; traditional interpretation of them has placed this arbitration late in the first half of the third century. In addition we are provided with a terminus post quem of c. 290 in the founding of Demetrias, the provenance of some of the witnesses; and a possible terminus ante quem of about 260/59 in the inclusion of Achaia Phthiotis, or at least Melitaia, in the Aitolian League. There is no mention of the Aitolian League in our inscription, and in fact it is the Macedonian influence that appears here, via Kassandreia and Demetrias. Hence a date of around 270–260 would place this arbitration during the years when Melitaia was still connected to the Macedonian power and before it had become a member of the Aitolian League.[5]

31. Judges from Kassandreia arbitrate the borders of Pereia, Phylladon, and Peuma (c. 270–260?)

The same inscription as **30**.

Raeder 35. For further bibliography see the citations in **30**.

3. Laurent, p. 340. In cases of arbitration we might expect ἀμφέλεγον πρὸς ἀλλήλους with the names of the disputants in the nominative; but here that is the position of the names of Melitaia and Chalai, while the name of the Peumatans is reserved for the next clause, πρὸς Πευματίους. Either this second phrase, πρὸς Πευματίους, explicates the first, πρὸς ἀλλήλους, or we have to understand that the Melitaians and Chalaians disputed the land between themselves and were only reconciled for the purpose of making sure that Peuma did not get it. Cf. Tod's criticism of Laurent's view.

4. Cf. the mutual use of a commonly held piece of ground in the agreement between Messene and Phigaleia (**40**).

5. See Laurent, p. 343; Daux, *BCH* 63, p. 158; Bousquet, p. 67. Cf. **32**, an arbitration carried out for Melitaia by a Macedonian functionary, perhaps also around 270–260. Melitaia also benefitted from arbitral judgements made in its favour once it joined the Aitolian League (**55**, **56**).

[vac] περὶ δὲ τῆς χώρας ἧς ἔκρι-
[ναν οἱ] Μελιταιεῖς πρὸς Πευματίους ὑπὲρ Πηρέ-
[ων κα]ὶ Φυλλαδονίων· ἐκρίναμεν εἶναι τὴν χώραν
[Πηρέ]ων καὶ Φυλλαδονίων ἣν περιήγαγον ἡμᾶς Με-
[λιτα]ιεῖς καὶ Πηρεῖς· ἀπὸ τῆς καλουμένης Γραίας
[Αὐλ]ῆς εἰς τὴν Νάπην καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Νάπης εἰς τὴν
. . . . ι̣νθειαν ἐπὶ τὸ ἄκρον, ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ ἄκρου ὡς ὕ-
[δωρ] ῥεῖ εἰς τὸν Κρουσίζοντα, ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ Κρουσίζον-
[τος εἰ]ς τὸν Κερκινεῖα καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Κερκινεῖος ἐπὶ
[τοὺς c]πόλους τοὺς ὁμολόγους εἰς τὴν ὁδὸν τὴν
[δημοσί]αν καὶ ἐκ τῆς ὁδοῦ εἰς τὸν βουλεῖα, καὶ ἐκ
[τοῦ βου]λεῖος εἰς τὸν Ἐλιπεῖα καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Χαρά-
[δρας] καὶ τοῦ Ἐλιπεῖος εἰς τὰ cυμβάλλοντα
[ἐπὶ τ]ὸ ἄκρον ὥcπερ οἱ cπόλοι ἔχουcιν εἰς τὸ Χυ-
[τρῖν]ον· μάρτυροι· Θηβαίων· Ἀρίcτιππος Ἱππο-
[δάμ]αντος, Μνacίθεος Φιλομήλου, Μνacιγέ-
[νης Φ]ιλοκράτου, Λέων Εὐρυβώτου, Κάπριος Ἀπη-
[μάντ]ου, Cιμάδας Ἀξιόχου, Πυθίας Φιλοστρά-
[του, Εὔ]ανδρος Ἀντιβούλου, Ἀcτοκλέας Χα-
[ριλάο]υ· Δημητριεῖς· Φανίας Ἰcτιαίου τραπε-
[ζίτης], Εὔανδρος Πρωταγόρου, Πολίτας Καλ-
[λιcθέ]γους.

16–17: ἔκρι|[ναν]: Stählin, *MDAI(A)*, p. 87. || 22: [3–4]ι̣νθειαν: Bousquet, who tentatively suggests [Κρη]ι̣νθείαν. || 22–23: εἰc Κ|. . . . ι εἰc κτλ.: Laurent. εἰc Κ .|. . . ΞΙ εἰc κτλ.: Kern, Schwyzer. ὡc ὕ|[δωρ ῥ]εῖ εἰc κτλ.: Bousquet. || 25: [τοὺc] πόλους: Laurent. [τοὺc c]πόλους: Wilamowitz, and the rest, as an Aeolism for cτόλους. || 25–26: τὴν| . . . . . ᾳν: Bousquet. || 29: ὥcπερ οἷc πόλοι: Laurent. || 29–30: εἰc τὸ Χυ|. . . . ον: Laurent, Schwyzer. Χυ|[τρεῖ]ον: Kern (following Hiller von Gaertringen). Χυ|[?τρῖν]ον: Bousquet. || 32: [Φ]ιλοκράτεος: Laurent, Kern, Schwyzer. [Φ]ιλοκράτου: Bousquet. Εὐρυβάτου: Laurent, Kern, Schwyzer. Εὐρυβώτου: Bousquet. || 32–33: Ἀγη|[cιλά]ου: Laurent. Ἀγη|[cιλά]ου: Schwyzer. Ἀπη|[μάντ]ου: Bousquet. || 32–34: the names between Leon and Euandros were omitted by Kern. || 34: Ἀριcτοκλέας: Laurent, Kern, Schwyzer. Ἀcτοκλέας: Bousquet. || 34–35: Χα|. . . . υ: Laurent. Χα|[ρίλο]υ: Kern, Schwyzer. Χα|[ριλάο]υ: Bousquet. || 36: Προταγόρου: Laurent. || 36–37: Καλ|[λιγέν]ους: Laurent, Kern, Schwyzer. Καλ|[λιcθέ]νους: Bousquet.

From this second arbitration by Kassandreian judges we learn that the territorial dispute between Peuma, on the one hand, and Pereia and Phylladon, on the other, had already been judged once by Melitaia (lines 16–18: ἧς ἔκρι|[ναν οἱ] Μελιταιεῖς πρὸς Πευματίους ὑπὲρ Πηρέ|[ων κα]ὶ Φυλλαδονίων). It seems probable that at this period both Melitaia and Peuma were trying to expand their territories. The communities lying between the two larger states may have been in some way reliant on Melitaia, perhaps forfeiting complete

independence for the sake of protection against the aggrandizement of Peuma.[1] Perhaps we see here the reason for the success of Melitaia; in effect, there may have been an anti-Peumatan coalition. Apparently the decision of the Kassandreians in this case, as in **30**, went against Peuma. The presence of Melitaians at the boundary examination is suspicious; ostensibly objective judges in this case at a previous date, they must now be the advocates of Pereia and Phylladon, not to mention the fact that they had their own boundary dispute with the Peumatans. It may be that their supposedly neutral status influenced the Kassandreian judges. Again it would be interesting to know why there were (perhaps) no Peumatan representatives at the examination of the disputed land.

32. Pyllos of Macedon arbitrates between Melitaia and Narthakion (c. 270–260 or c. 210–200?)

An inscription from about 140 B.C. found at the site of Narthakion in Thessaly; the inscription is given in full in **156**. Only the relevant portion (Sherk 9, lines 25–30) is cited here.

For editions and bibliography see **156**.

. . . . . ὅπως τοῦτο τὸ πρᾶ-
[γμα ἀκέρα]ιον αὐτοῖς ἀποκατασταθῇ οὕτω
[καθὼς πρότερο]ν ἐπὶ Μηδείωι καὶ ἐπὶ Θεσσαλῶν
. . . . . ων καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν περὶ Πύλλον Μακε-
[δόνων κεκρι]μένον αὐτοῖς ἦν, ταῦτά τε τὰ κ[ρί]-
[ματα κύρια ὅπω]ς ᾖ·

26: [ὑπὸ Ῥωμαί?]ων: Laticheff, Viereck, de Ruggiero, Berard, Dittenberger. [ἀκέρα]ιον: Kern. || 27–28: Θεσσαλῶν| [αὐτονομουμένω]ν: Laticheff, Berard. || 30: [κύρια αὐτοῖ]ς ᾖ: Laticheff, Viereck, de Ruggiero, Berard, Dittenberger, Hiller von Gaertringen, Abbott/Johnson. [ὅπω]ς ᾖ: Kern.

The small city of Melitaia in Phthiotic Achaia, in addition to being involved in numerous border disputes with its northern neighbours, had a similar quarrel with its neighbour to the southeast, Narthakion. Certain territories lying between the two states were the focus of this dispute. In the second-century inscription the Melitaians mention the "public" or "common" land and a

1. See Stählin, *MDAI(A)* 39, p. 88. By the end of the century Melitaia and *Pereia* were contesting land (**56**), where some of the landmarks, notably the rivers, seem to be the same as the ones mentioned here.

independence for the sake of protection against the aggrandizement of Peuma.[1] Perhaps we see here the reason for the success of Melitaia; in effect, there may have been an anti-Peumatan coalition. Apparently the decision of the Kassandreians in this case, as in **30**, went against Peuma. The presence of Melitaians at the boundary examination is suspicious; ostensibly objective judges in this case at a previous date, they must now be the advocates of Pereia and Phylladon, not to mention the fact that they had their own boundary dispute with the Peumatans. It may be that their supposedly neutral status influenced the Kassandreian judges. Again it would be interesting to know why there were (perhaps) no Peumatan representatives at the examination of the disputed land.

32. Pyllos of Macedon arbitrates between Melitaia and Narthakion (c. 270–260 or c. 210–200?)

An inscription from about 140 B.C. found at the site of Narthakion in Thessaly; the inscription is given in full in **156**. Only the relevant portion (Sherk 9, lines 25–30) is cited here.

For editions and bibliography see **156**.

. . . . . ὅπως τοῦτο τὸ πρᾶ-
[γμα ἀκέρα]ιον αὐτοῖς ἀποκατασταθῇ οὕτω
[καθὼς πρότερο]ν ἐπὶ Μηδείωι καὶ ἐπὶ Θεσσαλῶν
. . . . . ων καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν περὶ Πύλλον Μακε-
[δόνων κεκρι]μένον αὐτοῖς ἦν, ταῦτά τε τὰ κ[ρί]-
[ματα κύρια ὅπω]ς ᾖ·

26: [ὑπὸ Ῥωμαί?]ων: Laticheff, Viereck, de Ruggiero, Berard, Dittenberger. [ἀκέρα]ιον: Kern. || 27–28: Θεσσαλῶν| [αὐτονομουμένω]ν: Laticheff, Berard. || 30: [κύρια αὐτοῖ]ς ᾖ: Laticheff, Viereck, de Ruggiero, Berard, Dittenberger, Hiller von Gaertringen, Abbott/Johnson. [ὅπω]ς ᾖ: Kern.

The small city of Melitaia in Phthiotic Achaia, in addition to being involved in numerous border disputes with its northern neighbours, had a similar quarrel with its neighbour to the southeast, Narthakion. Certain territories lying between the two states were the focus of this dispute. In the second-century inscription the Melitaians mention the "public" or "common" land and a

1. See Stählin, *MDAI(A)* 39, p. 88. By the end of the century Melitaia and *Pereia* were contesting land (**56**), where some of the landmarks, notably the rivers, seem to be the same as the ones mentioned here.

"deserted region,"[1] claiming that this land, rightfully theirs, had been taken from them at some point in the past by the Narthakians. The Narthakian claim adds the information that the land in question also included certain temples, frequently a point of contention in interstate quarrels like this.[2]

This conflict was continually renewed over a period of at least two and a half centuries.[3] Around 140 B.C. the Roman senate handed down the most recent ruling for which we have any evidence. The arguments adduced by the embassies of Melitaia and Narthakion at that time provide us with the evidence for previous judgements in this dispute. There had been at least two earlier awards in the fourth century, one given by Medeios of Larisa, the other by the Thessalians. Both of them had apparently been favourable to Melitaia.[4] The award under discussion in the present case is one in the series adduced by the envoys of Melitaia when they laid their claims before the Roman senate. It, like the previous judgements of Medeios and of the Thessalians, supported Melitaia.

The implication of the phrase ἐπὶ τῶν περὶ Πύλλον Μακε|[δόνων] seems clear: the decision was made by a court of Macedonian judges under the leadership of an individual named Pyllos. No significant political figure (of the stature of a Medeios of Larisa) by the name of Pyllos is known. Accordingly, Berard changed the reading of the stone, proposing ΠΥΡΡΟΝ for ΠΥΛΛΟΝ, and suggested that Pyrrhos of Epiros was the arbitrator, at a date sometime around 288–287. Niese, on the other hand, corrected the reading to ΚΥΛΛΟΝ and understood it for a place-name; he dated the arbitration to the time after Pydna, 167–150.[5] But there is no need to correct the reading of the stone. A recognizable historical figure is not required here. An individual of some prestige would be sufficient to act as an arbitrator, along with a court of fellow Macedonians. Pyllos may have been a Macedonian *epistates*, responsible for the affairs within his jurisdiction in Thessaly. In the arbitration between Herakleion and Perrhaibian Gonnoi, the Macedonian *epistates* was responsible for carrying out the investigation and adjudication of their dispute in accordance with a διάγραμμα of the king, Philip V.[6]

It is impossible to date the arbitration of Pyllos between Melitaia and Narthakion with any certainty, since the inscription itself provides no real evidence. One or two possibilities may be suggested tentatively. This Macedonian arbitration between the two southern Thessalian communities could be dated,

1. "Public" or "common" land: [χώρας] δημοσίας (line 20). Cf. **56**, lines 12–13: τὰν δὲ δαμοσίαν χώ|ραν, where it may mean the land shared by the two states; and **74**, line 85. "Deserted region": χωρίου ἐρήμου (line 20). See Daverio Rocchi, pp. 31–37.
2. Lines 44, 49. Cf. **50**, **65**, **117**.
3. See **79**, **154**, **156**.
4. See Piccirilli 35 and 51.
5. Berard, pp. 34–35; Niese, vol. 3, p. 318. See Raeder, p. 48; cf. Tod, p. 106.
6. See **54**; cf. also **62** (?).

like that between Gonnoi and Herakleion, to the reign of Philip V, perhaps at some time after about 210, when Philip took Achaia Phthiotis out of Aitolian hands.[7] Another possibility would be to date the arbitration of the Macedonian Pyllos to the period around 270–260, when other arbitrations favouring Melitaia were being carried out under the Macedonian aegis (**30**, **31**).

33. The Aitolian and Akarnanian leagues provide for an arbitration between Agrai and Stratos (c. 263–262?)

A hollow bronze stele, engraved on both faces, discovered in the temple of Apollo at Thermon in Aitolia. The inscription contains information pertinent both to this case and to **41**. The stele was constructed of four separate tablets; h: 0.42 m; w (of the two broad faces): 0.36 m (avg.); w (of the two connecting narrow sides): 0.045 m. Only the relevant part of the text is cited here.

G. Soteriades, *AE* 1905, pp. 55f., no. 1; H. Swoboda, *Klio* 10 (1910) pp. 397–98; Dittenberger/Hiller von Gaertringen, *SIG*^{3} 421A; Schwyzer 381; *Klaffenbach, *IG* IX^2 1.3A; Buck 67; Schmitt 480; J. B. Hainsworth, *Tituli ad dialectos Graecas illustrandas selecti* II (Leiden, 1972) 10; Daverio Rocchi, pp. 115–17, no. 7.

H. Swoboda, *Klio* 10 (1910) pp. 397–405; A. Reinach, *JAN* 13 (1911) pp. 236–39; Wilhelm, *Attische Urkunden*, p. 37; E. Pozzi, *AAT* 47 (1911–12) pp. 222f.; Tod 28; C. D. Buck, *CPh* 8 (1913) p. 155; A. Reinach, *REp* 1 (1913) p. 395; T. Walek, *Klio* 14 (1915) p. 468; Steinwenter, p. 180; P. Treves, *RFC* n.s. 10 (1932) pp. 276–77; G. N. Cross, *Epirus* (Cambridge, 1932) pp. 128–34; Flacelière, p. 192; G. Klaffenbach, *Historia* 4 (1955) pp. 46–51; Robert, *REG* 1956, 136; C. Habicht, *Hermes* 85 (1957) pp. 90, 94; *SEG* XV.358; Préaux, pp. 259, 297; Larsen, *GFS*, pp. 266f., 304f.; Guarducci, *Epigrafia greca* II (Rome, 1969) pp. 547–49; Klose, p. 147; Gawantka, pp. 214, 88–89, 114, 146f.; Will, vol. 1, pp. 227–28, 323–24; P. Cabanes, *Ktema* 4 (1979) pp. 183–99; id., in *La Béotie antique* (Paris, 1985) pp. 355–56.

Συνθήκα καὶ συμμαχία
Αἰτωλοῖς καὶ Ἀκαρνάνοις
ἀγαθᾶι τύχαι. συνθήκα Αἰτωλοῖς καὶ Ἀκαρνάνοις ὁμόλογος· εἰρήναν
εἶμεν καὶ φιλίαν ποτ' ἀλλάλους, φίλους ἐόντας καὶ συμμάχους ἄμα-
5 τα τὸμ πάντα χρόνον, ὅρια ἔχοντας τᾶς χώρας τὸν Ἀχελῶιον ποταμ-
ὸν ἄχρι εἰς θάλασσαν. τὰ μὲν ποτ' ἀῶ τοῦ Ἀχελώιου ποταμοῦ Αἰτωλῶν εἶμεν,
τὰ δὲ

7. See G. Klaffenbach, *IG* IX^2.1, p. xxxiii. Just before Aitolia lost Achaia Phthiotis to Philip, Melitaia had been involved in other arbitrations with its other neighbours, adjudicated by Aitolian judges: **55**, **56**.

like that between Gonnoi and Herakleion, to the reign of Philip V, perhaps at some time after about 210, when Philip took Achaia Phthiotis out of Aitolian hands.[7] Another possibility would be to date the arbitration of the Macedonian Pyllos to the period around 270–260, when other arbitrations favouring Melitaia were being carried out under the Macedonian aegis (**30**, **31**).

33. The Aitolian and Akarnanian leagues provide for an arbitration between Agrai and Stratos (c. 263–262?)

A hollow bronze stele, engraved on both faces, discovered in the temple of Apollo at Thermon in Aitolia. The inscription contains information pertinent both to this case and to **41**. The stele was constructed of four separate tablets; h: 0.42 m; w (of the two broad faces): 0.36 m (avg.); w (of the two connecting narrow sides): 0.045 m. Only the relevant part of the text is cited here.

G. Soteriades, *AE* 1905, pp. 55f., no. 1; H. Swoboda, *Klio* 10 (1910) pp. 397–98; Dittenberger/Hiller von Gaertringen, *SIG*^{3} 421A; Schwyzer 381; *Klaffenbach, *IG* IX^2 1.3A; Buck 67; Schmitt 480; J. B. Hainsworth, *Tituli ad dialectos Graecas illustrandas selecti* II (Leiden, 1972) 10; Daverio Rocchi, pp. 115–17, no. 7.

H. Swoboda, *Klio* 10 (1910) pp. 397–405; A. Reinach, *JAN* 13 (1911) pp. 236–39; Wilhelm, *Attische Urkunden*, p. 37; E. Pozzi, *AAT* 47 (1911–12) pp. 222f.; Tod 28; C. D. Buck, *CPh* 8 (1913) p. 155; A. Reinach, *REp* 1 (1913) p. 395; T. Walek, *Klio* 14 (1915) p. 468; Steinwenter, p. 180; P. Treves, *RFC* n.s. 10 (1932) pp. 276–77; G. N. Cross, *Epirus* (Cambridge, 1932) pp. 128–34; Flacelière, p. 192; G. Klaffenbach, *Historia* 4 (1955) pp. 46–51; Robert, *REG* 1956, 136; C. Habicht, *Hermes* 85 (1957) pp. 90, 94; *SEG* XV.358; Préaux, pp. 259, 297; Larsen, *GFS*, pp. 266f., 304f.; Guarducci, *Epigrafia greca* II (Rome, 1969) pp. 547–49; Klose, p. 147; Gawantka, pp. 214, 88–89, 114, 146f.; Will, vol. 1, pp. 227–28, 323–24; P. Cabanes, *Ktema* 4 (1979) pp. 183–99; id., in *La Béotie antique* (Paris, 1985) pp. 355–56.

Συνθήκα καὶ συμμαχία
Αἰτωλοῖς καὶ Ἀκαρνάνοις
ἀγαθᾶι τύχαι. συνθήκα Αἰτωλοῖς καὶ Ἀκαρνάνοις ὁμόλογος· εἰρήναν
εἶμεν καὶ φιλίαν ποτ' ἀλλάλους, φίλους ἐόντας καὶ συμμάχους ἄμα-
5 τα τὸμ πάντα χρόνον, ὅρια ἔχοντας τᾶς χώρας τὸν Ἀχελῶιον ποταμ-
ὸν ἄχρι εἰς θάλασσαν. τὰ μὲν ποτ' ἀῶ τοῦ Ἀχελώιου ποταμοῦ Αἰτωλῶν εἶμεν,
τὰ δὲ

7. See G. Klaffenbach, *IG* IX^2.1, p. xxxiii. Just before Aitolia lost Achaia Phthiotis to Philip, Melitaia had been involved in other arbitrations with its other neighbours, adjudicated by Aitolian judges: **55**, **56**.

ποθ' ἐπέραν Ἀκαρνάνων πλὰν τοῦ Πραντὸς καὶ τᾶς Δεμφίδος· ταύτας δὲ Ἀκαρνᾶν-
ες οὐκ ἀντιποιοῦνται. ὑπὲρ δὲ τῶν τερμόνων τοῦ Πραντός, εἰ μέγ κα Στράτιοι καὶ Ἀγραῖ-
οι συγχωρέωντι αὐτοὶ ποτ' αὐτούς, τοῦτο κύριον ἔστω· εἰ δὲ μή, Ἀκαρνᾶνες καὶ Αἰτωλοὶ
10 τερμαξάντω τὰμ Πραντίδα χώραν, αἱρεθέντας (sic) ἑκατέρων δέκα πλὰν Στρατίων καὶ Ἀγρα⟨ί⟩-
ων· καθὼς δέ κα τερμάξωντι, τέλειον ἔστω.

10: ΑΓΡΑ.

This document, which records a treaty and alliance between the Aitolian and Akarnanian leagues, was discovered in the temple of Apollo at Thermon. This is the Aitolian copy; the Akarnanian one would have been published in the temple of Apollo at Aktion. The other sites mentioned in lines 14f. were major international sanctuaries: Delphi, Dodona, and Olympia.[1] The treaty between the two leagues is accompanied by certain boundary specifications. As these are the only qualifications mentioned in the treaty, it can be assumed that they represented the most important problems that had to be settled before its ratification. The other provisions of the treaty are all standard and would not provide any occasion for disagreement. The boundary settlements, however, had to be negotiated before any formal agreement could be made.

The river Acheloös was the historical boundary between Aitolia and Akarnania, often a subject of dispute in the past, as Strabo says, "because they had no arbitrators" (10.2.19). The conditions set out in this treaty designate the river as the border between the two leagues, the territory to the west being Akarnanian, that to the east Aitolian. While this allowed Akarnania to retain Oiniadai, a contested possession, Aitolia, the stronger partner, was thus permitted to retain land it had conquered in 314.[2] Akarnania also agreed to relinquish claims to Pras and Demphis, certain territories on the western bank of the Acheloös. The arbitration involved in this case is potential rather than actual.[3] The land called Pras apparently lay to the north of the Akarnanian community of Stratos, between it and Aitolian Agrai.[4] The Akarnanians had relinquished their claim to it, although it lay on the west bank of the Acheloös; but it does not seem that Pras was therefore automatically taken into Aitolian possession.[5] Instead,

1. A fragment of the copy from Olympia was published in *IOlympia* 40 and recognized as such by Wilhelm, *AE* 1910, p. 147.

2. Diod. 19.67–68. See Larsen, *GFS*, p. 267.

3. Provisions in a treaty for eventual arbitration of disputes (although not always for one as specific as this) appear in **13**, **92**, and **108**. See Préaux, p. 259.

4. See *IG* IX^2 1, *add.* to no. 3A (p. 82); Soteriades, p. 75; *SIG*^{3} 421, n. 4.

5. Perhaps "Demphis," however, did become Aitolian, since we hear no more about it.

provision was made for the two communities of Stratos and Agrai to reach some form of settlement between themselves concerning the boundaries of the land. If they could not reach an agreement, then outside authorities would take on the task of drawing the boundaries for them. A commission of ten representatives from Aitolia and ten from Akarnania was to be formed. The various cities belonging to the two leagues were to be responsible for supplying the commissioners, although in the interests of objectivity, Stratos and Agrai were excluded from participating. The judgement of this commission was to be final and binding.[6]

It is interesting to compare the arbitration between Aigosthena and Pagai in the first decade of the second century (**85**). The issue there was also one of border territory, specifically a harbour claimed by both Aigosthena and Pagai. Since the former was a member of the Boiotian League, while the latter belonged to the Achaian League, a boundary dispute between them presented some special problems analogous to the situation involving Stratos and Agrai. The federal leagues of the Hellenistic period generally dealt with boundary disputes within the *koinon* by appointing a third city within the league to make a decision or by employing the league governing body itself for this task.[7] In the case of Stratos and Agrai, as in the case of Aigosthena and Pagai, neither of these was a viable approach. The power of final judgement could not be granted to only one of the leagues involved. Here the Aitolians and Akarnanians solved a potentially troublesome issue in advance by establishing provisions for a joint commission with equal representation from both leagues. For Aigosthena and Pagai, the impasse of interleague arbitration was solved by going outside the Boiotian and Achaian *koina* entirely to find the arbitrators, who came from western Greece. The two cases thus represent different approaches to a similar problem for federations.

The date to which this treaty should be assigned has been a vexed question, although the most reasonable reconstruction of events would place it towards the end of the Chremonidean War, around 263 or 262.[8] In 263 Alexander II of Epiros fled from Macedonian troops to Akarnania, which had been allied to his father, Pyrrhos. The threat of Macedonian annexation of Epiros, and later perhaps of Akarnania and Aitolia itself, would have led the Aitolians to be reconciled with their old enemy Akarnania. This coalition could then have aided the restoration of Alexander around 262. Perhaps it was

6. τέλειον ἔστω. Elsewhere (line 9) we find the phrase κύριον ἔστω; cf. **92**, line 48: τὰ κριθέντα κύρια, and **153**, line 12: τὰ κριθέντα ὑπὸ τούτου κύρια εἶμεν.

7. The appointment of a third member city of the league: **3**, **38**, **41**, **56**; arbitration by a league governing body: **16**, **17**.

8. See Klaffenbach, *Klio* 24 (1931); id., *IG* IX^2 1, p. xviii; id., *Historia* 4. Schmitt (p. 144), Will (vol. 1, p. 228), and Larsen (*GFS*, p. 266) give concise descriptions of the reconstruction of events in the 260s, most of which is a result of Klaffenbach's work.

the imminent danger of war with Macedon that led the Aitolians to be so "generous" here, and that led the Akarnanians to renounce their territorial claims.

34. Herakleia Pontica offers to resolve the conflict between Byzantion and Istros-Kallatis (253–247)

Memnon, *FGH* 434 F13 (Photios 228a–b).

Vulic, *RE* X.2 (1919) col. 1611, 6f., s.v. "Kallatis"; P. Desideri, *SCO* 16 (1967) p. 410.

> Οὐ πολλῶι δὲ ὕστερον χρόνωι πόλεμος ἀνερράγη Βυζαντίοις πρὸς Καλατιανούς (ἄποικοι δὲ οὗτοι Ἡρακλεωτῶν ἦσαν) καὶ πρὸς Ἰστριανοὺς περὶ Τόμεως τοῦ ἐμπορίου, ὃ τοῖς Καλατιανοῖς ὅμορον ἦν, μονοπώλιον τοῦτο διανοουμένων κατασκευάσαι τῶν Καλατιανῶν. διεπρεσβεύοντο οὖν πρὸς Ἡρακλεώτας ἐπὶ συμμαχίαν ἑκάτεροι· οἱ δὲ πολεμικὴν μὲν ῥοπὴν οὐδετέρωι ἔνεμον μέρει, διαλλακτηρίους δὲ ἄνδρας ἑκατέροις ἀπέστελλον, κἂν ἄπρακτος αὐτῶν ἡ σπουδὴ τότε γέγονε. πολλὰ δὲ οἱ τῆς Καλλατίδος ὑπὸ τῶν πολεμίων παθόντες, ὕστερον εἰς διαλύσεις ἦλθον, ἀπὸ ταύτης τῆς συμφορᾶς οὐκέτι σχεδὸν ἀναλαβεῖν αὑτοὺς δυνηθέντες.

Sometime around the middle of the third century a war broke out among some of the Black Sea states. The background was clearly one of trade rivalry, as the immediate issue was Kallatis's attempt to establish a trade monopoly at the port of Tomis, which bordered on the Kallatian state. Supporting Kallatis was the state of Istros. Their enemy was the state that saw itself as the overseer of most of the Black Sea export and import trade, Byzantion. Both sides in the dispute turned to Herakleia Pontica for help, and specifically for an alliance. Kallatis was a colony of Herakleia, but Herakleia did not respond to its request for support quite as the Kallatians expected.[1] Perhaps the Herakleians were persuaded not to by the Byzantine embassy that also came requesting an alliance; or perhaps Herakleia's natural inclinations lay with Byzantion all along (both were members of the third-century league of northern states). Any reluctance Herakleia would have had to join the Byzantine side may have sprung only from its special ties to Kallatis. Whatever the case, it is clear that Herakleia did not wish to be involved in this conflict in any military capacity.

The Herakleians did make an effort to help, however. Since each side had looked for their support, they offered the only kind they could reasonably extend

1. See Vulic for the sources attesting to Kallatis as a colony of Herakleia.

the imminent danger of war with Macedon that led the Aitolians to be so "generous" here, and that led the Akarnanians to renounce their territorial claims.

34. Herakleia Pontica offers to resolve the conflict between Byzantion and Istros-Kallatis (253–247)

Memnon, *FGH* 434 F13 (Photios 228a–b).

Vulic, *RE* X.2 (1919) col. 1611, 6f., s.v. "Kallatis"; P. Desideri, *SCO* 16 (1967) p. 410.

> Οὐ πολλῶι δὲ ὕστερον χρόνωι πόλεμος ἀνερράγη Βυζαντίοις πρὸς Καλατιανούς (ἄποικοι δὲ οὗτοι Ἡρακλεωτῶν ἦσαν) καὶ πρὸς Ἰστριανοὺς περὶ Τόμεως τοῦ ἐμπορίου, ὃ τοῖς Καλατιανοῖς ὅμορον ἦν, μονοπώλιον τοῦτο διανοουμένων κατασκευάσαι τῶν Καλατιανῶν. διεπρεσβεύοντο οὖν πρὸς Ἡρακλεώτας ἐπὶ συμμαχίαν ἑκάτεροι· οἱ δὲ πολεμικὴν μὲν ῥοπὴν οὐδετέρωι ἔνεμον μέρει, διαλλακτηρίους δὲ ἄνδρας ἑκατέροις ἀπέστελλον, κἂν ἄπρακτος αὐτῶν ἡ σπουδὴ τότε γέγονε. πολλὰ δὲ οἱ τῆς Καλλατίδος ὑπὸ τῶν πολεμίων παθόντες, ὕστερον εἰς διαλύσεις ἦλθον, ἀπὸ ταύτης τῆς συμφορᾶς οὐκέτι σχεδὸν ἀναλαβεῖν αὑτοὺς δυνηθέντες.

Sometime around the middle of the third century a war broke out among some of the Black Sea states. The background was clearly one of trade rivalry, as the immediate issue was Kallatis's attempt to establish a trade monopoly at the port of Tomis, which bordered on the Kallatian state. Supporting Kallatis was the state of Istros. Their enemy was the state that saw itself as the overseer of most of the Black Sea export and import trade, Byzantion. Both sides in the dispute turned to Herakleia Pontica for help, and specifically for an alliance. Kallatis was a colony of Herakleia, but Herakleia did not respond to its request for support quite as the Kallatians expected.[1] Perhaps the Herakleians were persuaded not to by the Byzantine embassy that also came requesting an alliance; or perhaps Herakleia's natural inclinations lay with Byzantion all along (both were members of the third-century league of northern states). Any reluctance Herakleia would have had to join the Byzantine side may have sprung only from its special ties to Kallatis. Whatever the case, it is clear that Herakleia did not wish to be involved in this conflict in any military capacity.

The Herakleians did make an effort to help, however. Since each side had looked for their support, they offered the only kind they could reasonably extend

1. See Vulic for the sources attesting to Kallatis as a colony of Herakleia.

to both. Herakleia's ambassadors informed the combatants that their state was prepared to resolve the conflict and reconcile the warring parties. In this fashion Herakleia could free itself from the obligation of military action, as well as retain the friendship of both parties while alienating neither.[2] In the end, however, the Herakleian conciliators failed, and the war continued. It only came to an end when Kallatis was finally forced to come to an agreement. The war had gone very badly for Kallatis, and we must assume that the final settlement reflected Byzantine desires.

35. Ptolemy II offers to mediate between Carthage and Rome in the First Punic War (252)

Appian *Sicelica* 1.

Matthaei, *CQ*, 254–56; Holleaux, *Monarchies hellénistiques*, p. 65; G. C. Picard and C. Picard, *The Life and Death of Carthage* (London, 1968) p. 199; H. Heinen, *ANRW* I.1 (1972) p. 638; Will, vol. 1, pp. 194f.; vol. 2, pp. 92–93; Gruen, p. 100; Eckstein, *Historia* 37 (1988) p. 416.

Καρχηδόνιοι δ' ἐς Πτολεμαῖον ἐπρεσβεύοντο, τὸν Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Λάγου βασιλέα Αἰγύπτου, δισχίλια τάλαντα χιχρώμενοι. τῷ δ' ἦν ἔς τε Ῥωμαίους καὶ Καρχηδονίους φιλία καὶ συναλλάξαι σφᾶς ἐπεχείρησεν ἀλλήλοις. οὐ δυνηθεὶς δ' ἔφη χρῆναι φίλοις κατ' ἐχθρῶν συμμαχεῖν, οὐ κατὰ φίλων.

In the latter years of the First Punic War, both Carthaginians and Romans were finding it difficult to maintain the financial effort necessary to continue the fight. Appian reports that the Romans were unable to pursue their shipbuilding, although they managed to continue to levy infantry. The Carthaginians turned to Ptolemy II of Egypt and asked him for a loan of 2,000 talents. Aside from the expense involved in such a loan, Ptolemy would have been aware that it was intended for use against another of his friends, Rome. Accordingly he refused and instead offered his services in bringing about a peace between Rome and Carthage. As a potential arbitrator, Ptolemy offered all that could be desired. As monarch of Egypt he certainly had sufficient prestige. His refusal to send aid to either party (whatever its motivation) was a public indication of his neutrality. This apparent objective interest in a fair and peaceful settlement went hand in hand with goodwill towards both parties: Ptolemy could claim ties of friendship

2. Cf. 35.

to both. Herakleia's ambassadors informed the combatants that their state was prepared to resolve the conflict and reconcile the warring parties. In this fashion Herakleia could free itself from the obligation of military action, as well as retain the friendship of both parties while alienating neither.[2] In the end, however, the Herakleian conciliators failed, and the war continued. It only came to an end when Kallatis was finally forced to come to an agreement. The war had gone very badly for Kallatis, and we must assume that the final settlement reflected Byzantine desires.

35. Ptolemy II offers to mediate between Carthage and Rome in the First Punic War (252)

Appian *Sicelica* 1.

Matthaei, *CQ*, 254–56; Holleaux, *Monarchies hellénistiques*, p. 65; G. C. Picard and C. Picard, *The Life and Death of Carthage* (London, 1968) p. 199; H. Heinen, *ANRW* I.1 (1972) p. 638; Will, vol. 1, pp. 194f.; vol. 2, pp. 92–93; Gruen, p. 100; Eckstein, *Historia* 37 (1988) p. 416.

Καρχηδόνιοι δ' ἐς Πτολεμαῖον ἐπρεσβεύοντο, τὸν Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Λάγου βασιλέα Αἰγύπτου, δισχίλια τάλαντα χιχρώμενοι. τῷ δ' ἦν ἔς τε Ῥωμαίους καὶ Καρχηδονίους φιλία καὶ συναλλάξαι σφᾶς ἐπεχείρησεν ἀλλήλοις. οὐ δυνηθεὶς δ' ἔφη χρῆναι φίλοις κατ' ἐχθρῶν συμμαχεῖν, οὐ κατὰ φίλων.

In the latter years of the First Punic War, both Carthaginians and Romans were finding it difficult to maintain the financial effort necessary to continue the fight. Appian reports that the Romans were unable to pursue their shipbuilding, although they managed to continue to levy infantry. The Carthaginians turned to Ptolemy II of Egypt and asked him for a loan of 2,000 talents. Aside from the expense involved in such a loan, Ptolemy would have been aware that it was intended for use against another of his friends, Rome. Accordingly he refused and instead offered his services in bringing about a peace between Rome and Carthage. As a potential arbitrator, Ptolemy offered all that could be desired. As monarch of Egypt he certainly had sufficient prestige. His refusal to send aid to either party (whatever its motivation) was a public indication of his neutrality. This apparent objective interest in a fair and peaceful settlement went hand in hand with goodwill towards both parties: Ptolemy could claim ties of friendship

2. Cf. 35.

with both Rome and Carthage.[1] Nevertheless, neither Rome nor Carthage, in their struggle for dominance, was interested in pacific third-party settlement by a Hellenistic monarch.[2] As for Ptolemy himself, the notion of settling the Punic conflict might have presented itself to him as a way of enhancing his prestige considerably. Even if success seemed impossible, his offer to mediate would have freed him from the situation of being caught between two warring friends. After refusing his offer, neither side could now reasonably call upon him for financial or military aid.

36. Members of the Achaian League arbitrate between two unknown states (c. 250–200)

Inscription on a limestone slab, broken away along the left side; discovered at Aigion in the Peloponnese. H: 0.366 m; w: 0.26 m; d: 0.10 m.

*J. Bingen, *BCH* 77 (1953) pp. 616–28, no. 1; *SEG* XIII.278.

Robert, *REG* 1955, 115; N. D. Robertson, *Hesperia* 45 (1976) p. 266.

[- - - - - - - - - - - - - τὸ ἱερ]ὸν τᾶς Νι̣χε̣[ίας . . .]
[- - - - - - - - - - - ἐπὶ τὰν c]υμβολὰν τοῦ Ῥιγο-
[στασίου - - - καὶ τοῦ - - - - - ποτ]αμοῦ? καὶ ἀπὸ τᾶς c-
[υμβολᾶς - - - ἐπὶ - - - - - - -] τὸν Ῥιγοστάσιον κ-
5 [αὶ ἀπὸ - - - - - - - - -] ἐπὶ τὸ ἱερὸν τᾶς Νικείας τᾶ-
[c - - καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱεροῦ τᾶς Νικείας ἐπὶ τὰ]ν̣ δέραν τοῦ ιπειου : δικασταὶ
[τοὶ κρίναντες τοίδε· κτλ...]

The remainder of the surviving lines of the inscription (7–31) contains the names of the judges, arranged by city.

This inscription, mutilated as it is, clearly shows that it contained a boundary delimitation and a list of the judges who carried it out. In form it resembles closely the delimitation and list of judges in **38**, a case from around the same period, also involving the Achaian League. At line 16 the ethnic Δυμαῖοι tells us that some of them, at any rate, came from the Achaian city of Dyme, and from

1. As exemplified in his (apocryphal?) statement as recorded by Appian. See Holleaux, *Monarchies hellénistiques*, pp. 64f., on the nature of the ties between Rome and Egypt at this stage; and see Will, vol. 1, pp. 195f.

2. Matthaei (p. 256) does argue that since the Carthaginian ambassadors had approached Ptolemy first and were (apparently) at his court when the offer was made, then the attempt to mediate should have had their consent; it was therefore the Romans who, typically, refused to go to mediation. But the account in Appian is too imprecise to say whether this must have been the case.

with both Rome and Carthage.[1] Nevertheless, neither Rome nor Carthage, in their struggle for dominance, was interested in pacific third-party settlement by a Hellenistic monarch.[2] As for Ptolemy himself, the notion of settling the Punic conflict might have presented itself to him as a way of enhancing his prestige considerably. Even if success seemed impossible, his offer to mediate would have freed him from the situation of being caught between two warring friends. After refusing his offer, neither side could now reasonably call upon him for financial or military aid.

36. Members of the Achaian League arbitrate between two unknown states (c. 250–200)

Inscription on a limestone slab, broken away along the left side; discovered at Aigion in the Peloponnese. H: 0.366 m; w: 0.26 m; d: 0.10 m.

*J. Bingen, *BCH* 77 (1953) pp. 616–28, no. 1; *SEG* XIII.278.

Robert, *REG* 1955, 115; N. D. Robertson, *Hesperia* 45 (1976) p. 266.

[- - - - - - - - - - - - - τὸ ἱερ]ὸν τᾶς Νι̣χε̣[ίας . . .]
[- - - - - - - - - - - ἐπὶ τὰν c]υμβολὰν τοῦ Ῥιγο-
[στασίου - - - καὶ τοῦ - - - - - ποτ]αμοῦ? καὶ ἀπὸ τᾶς c-
[υμβολᾶς - - - ἐπὶ - - - - - - -] τὸν Ῥιγοστάσιον κ-
5 [αὶ ἀπὸ - - - - - - - - -] ἐπὶ τὸ ἱερὸν τᾶς Νικείας τᾶ-
[c - - καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱεροῦ τᾶς Νικείας ἐπὶ τὰ]ν̣ δέραν τοῦ ιπειου : δικασταὶ
[τοὶ κρίναντες τοίδε· κτλ...]

The remainder of the surviving lines of the inscription (7–31) contains the names of the judges, arranged by city.

This inscription, mutilated as it is, clearly shows that it contained a boundary delimitation and a list of the judges who carried it out. In form it resembles closely the delimitation and list of judges in **38**, a case from around the same period, also involving the Achaian League. At line 16 the ethnic Δυμαῖοι tells us that some of them, at any rate, came from the Achaian city of Dyme, and from

1. As exemplified in his (apocryphal?) statement as recorded by Appian. See Holleaux, *Monarchies hellénistiques*, pp. 64f., on the nature of the ties between Rome and Egypt at this stage; and see Will, vol. 1, pp. 195f.

2. Matthaei (p. 256) does argue that since the Carthaginian ambassadors had approached Ptolemy first and were (apparently) at his court when the offer was made, then the attempt to mediate should have had their consent; it was therefore the Romans who, typically, refused to go to mediation. But the account in Appian is too imprecise to say whether this must have been the case.

the form of the inscription it seems at least two other cities must have provided judges.[1] Fifty-nine names remain, in whole or in part; the actual number of judges must have been much higher. The topographic references to συμβολά and δέρα, and to a sacred precinct as a landmark for border demarcation, are all paralleled in other boundary arbitrations.[2]

The first part of this inscription, the boundary demarcation, is written in the Doric κοινή common to other Achaian inscriptions of the same period. It would have been standard practice to publish the findings of the judges in their own dialect.[3] The list of judges, on the other hand, with the genitive endings in -ω, is clearly a different dialect from that of the judges themselves. The conclusion to be drawn is that this inscription is a copy of the arbitration published by one or the other of the two litigant states; the dialect of the judges was conserved in their decision, but when it came to listing their names, the native dialect of the litigant state was employed. This appears to have been one of the states of the western Peloponnese, though whether it might have been Messenia, Lakonia, or Elis remains uncertain.[4]

37. Elis arbitrates between Alipheira and a neighbouring state (?) (244–219)

A fragment of a stele discovered in an irrigation channel at Alipheira in Arkadia (now illegible).

A. K. Orlandos, Ἡ Ἀρκαδικὴ Ἀλίφειρα καὶ τὰ μνημεῖά της (Athens, 1967–68) pp. 151–57, no. 2; *A. G. Woodhead, *SEG* XXV.448.

Robert, *REG* 1969, 266; N. D. Robertson, *Hesperia* 45 (1976) pp. 260–62; *SEG* XXVI.470; Robert, *REG* 1977, 205.

- -
λυτ[ὰ] ἐν Ἀριστοδάμοι ἃ Καλλιστράτοι ἀναγ- - - - - - - -
- -Τ- - ἐ[γκ]λήματορ, τὰ δὲ Ε . ΜΜΑΤΑΟ . Σ Ἀριστο[δάμο- -]
- - κυρίαν μὲν ΙΤΛΑΝΑ τινὰ τᾶρ πόλιορ τᾶρ τ[ῶν Ἀλιφειρ]-
[έων] τὸ δαμιοργοῖρ ΙΙΙΙΑΜΕ . ΟΙΑ . . λόμενορ ἀλλ- - - - - -
5 [ἔκρ]ινεν τὸ δικαστήριον τὸ τᾶρ πόλιορ το- - - - - - - - - -
. Υ . ΙΧΙΡ ἦμεν ταῖρ ἐξ ἀρχᾶρ γενομέναιρ τοῦ ο- - - - - - -

1. Apparently the judges were listed by city; cf. **46**, where judges from cities in Achaia were also listed by city, among them Pellene, Aigion, and Thelpoussa.

2. Cf. **18**, **30**, **31**, **56**, **116**.

3. Bingen, pp. 618–19. See Buck, *CPh* 8 (1913).

4. Bingen, p. 620. The inscription may have been published at the Hamarion, the federal sanctuary of the Achaian League at Aigion.

the form of the inscription it seems at least two other cities must have provided judges.[1] Fifty-nine names remain, in whole or in part; the actual number of judges must have been much higher. The topographic references to συμβολά and δέρα, and to a sacred precinct as a landmark for border demarcation, are all paralleled in other boundary arbitrations.[2]

The first part of this inscription, the boundary demarcation, is written in the Doric κοινή common to other Achaian inscriptions of the same period. It would have been standard practice to publish the findings of the judges in their own dialect.[3] The list of judges, on the other hand, with the genitive endings in -ω, is clearly a different dialect from that of the judges themselves. The conclusion to be drawn is that this inscription is a copy of the arbitration published by one or the other of the two litigant states; the dialect of the judges was conserved in their decision, but when it came to listing their names, the native dialect of the litigant state was employed. This appears to have been one of the states of the western Peloponnese, though whether it might have been Messenia, Lakonia, or Elis remains uncertain.[4]

37. Elis arbitrates between Alipheira and a neighbouring state (?) (244–219)

A fragment of a stele discovered in an irrigation channel at Alipheira in Arkadia (now illegible).

A. K. Orlandos, Ἡ Ἀρκαδικὴ Ἀλίφειρα καὶ τὰ μνημεῖά της (Athens, 1967–68) pp. 151–57, no. 2; *A. G. Woodhead, *SEG* XXV.448.

Robert, *REG* 1969, 266; N. D. Robertson, *Hesperia* 45 (1976) pp. 260–62; *SEG* XXVI.470; Robert, *REG* 1977, 205.

- -
λυτ[ὰ] ἐν Ἀριστοδάμοι ἃ Καλλιστράτοι ἀναγ- - - - - - - -
- -Τ- - ἐ[γκ]λήματορ, τὰ δὲ Ε . ΜΜΑΤΑΟ . Σ Ἀριστο[δάμο- -]
- - κυρίαν μὲν ΙΤΛΑΝΑ τινὰ τᾶρ πόλιορ τᾶρ τ[ῶν Ἀλιφειρ]-
[έων] τὸ δαμιοργοῖρ ΙΙΙΙΑΜΕ . ΟΙΑ . . λόμενορ ἀλλ- - - - - -
5 [ἔκρ]ινεν τὸ δικαστήριον τὸ τᾶρ πόλιορ το- - - - - - - - - -
. Υ . ΙΧΙΡ ἦμεν ταῖρ ἐξ ἀρχᾶρ γενομέναιρ τοῦ ο- - - - - - -

1. Apparently the judges were listed by city; cf. **46**, where judges from cities in Achaia were also listed by city, among them Pellene, Aigion, and Thelpoussa.

2. Cf. **18**, **30**, **31**, **56**, **116**.

3. Bingen, pp. 618–19. See Buck, *CPh* 8 (1913).

4. Bingen, p. 620. The inscription may have been published at the Hamarion, the federal sanctuary of the Achaian League at Aigion.

- -ΕΟΚΙΑΓ . ΟΤΕΛΥΑΝΑΙΤ . ἄλλοιρ Α . ΟΝΤΕ- - - - - - - - -
- - -ΤΕΙ ὑπὸ Ἀριστοδάμω ἃ Καλλιστράτω μαλ- - - - - - - -
- - ἀποτειάτω μναῖρ πεντεκαίδεκα ΑΤΕ . ΗΡΕΙ- - - - - - - -
- - -ΠΟ . . ΟΝΤΩΝ . ΠΥΤΟΜΜΕΝΜΝΑΣΙΟΡ ἑκατὸν - - - - - - - -
- - -ΝΕΝΕΑΝΤ . . αὐτὸν δὲ μὰ καταχράστω - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - -ΤΑΓΓΕΓΟ . Ι . ΕΝΑΝΣΙ τὰρ δὲ στάλαρ Ι- - - - - - - -
[- - ἐ]ν τοῖ ἰαροῖ τᾶρ Ἀθά[ναρ]· ὁμόσσαι δὲ ἐν - - - - - - -
- - - - - -ΑΞΑΑΝΤΙΡΑΙΠΑΝΙ . . ΙΤΟΡ οἱ πολῖται - - - - - - - -
- - - - - -ΙΝΜΙΙ . τὸ μὲν [ἐ]ν Ἀλιφείραι τοῖ δάμο[ι] τοῖρ - -
- - - - - -τον δὲ τὸν αὐτὸν ὅρκον ΙΑΚΑ ταῖρ Δ- - - - - - - -
- - - - - -ΑΛΟΓΟΙ ἐόντα καὶ τοῖρ ἄλλοιρ ΟΡΟΝΟΝ- - - - - -
- - - - - - γωνικόν· αἰ δέ κα ἐπιστατον δοκέοι - - - - - - -
[- - - - - τ]ὸν δὲ ΥΩΔΟΥΜ . . ΟΓΑΡ . Ι . . . . στάλαιρ ἐν - - -
- - - - - - - τί κα ΔΟΕΑΓΕΟ . ΑΙΑ . . ταῖρ Ι . ΑΤΙ- - - - - - -
- -

3–5: - - κύρια ἦμεν τὰ δ̣ε̣δ̣[ο]γ̣μ̣[έ]να τᾶρ πόλιορ τᾶρ τ[ῶν Ἀλείων· ὅπωρ δὲ παραδοθᾶι], το[ῖρ] δαμιοργοῖρ ἐ̣π̣ι̣μέ[λε]ς̣ς̣α̣[ι . . . ἐ]λομένο[ι]ρ ἄ̣ν̣δ̣[ρερ - - κατὰ τάδε ἔκρ]ινεν τὸ δικαστήριον τὸ τᾶρ πόλιορ τῷ̣[ν Ἀλείων - -]: Robertson. || 6: ταὶρ: Robertson. || 9: μναίρ: Robertson. || 10: μνᾶς ιορ ἑκατὸν: Orlandos. || 12–13: τᾶρ δὲ στάλαρ τ[ὰν ἀνάθεσιν τοὶ Ἀλιφείρειρ ποιηάντω ἐ]ν τοι ἰαροι τᾶρ Ἀθά[ναρ]: Robertson.

The extreme illegibility of this inscription makes it difficult to determine the subject of the document, but it may refer to an arbitration between Alipheira and some neighbouring state. The mention of a δικαστήριον (line 5) and the potential payment of some fine (line 9) might suggest this. The oath (lines 13, 16), the guarantee clause (line 3), and the provision for publication in a temple (lines 12–13) were also typical aspects of international arbitration. Orlandos believed the document to be a decree of the Alipheirans. Robertson's careful study of the Eleian dialect used in this inscription and elsewhere, however, indicates that this is more likely to be a decree of Elis.[1] If so, then this may have been an arbitration carried out by Elis in order to settle local disputes. The most appropriate time for such activity on the part of Elis is during the decades when it controlled the neighbourhood of Alipheira, from about 244, when it received it from Lydiades of Megalopolis, down to 219, when it lost it to Philip V.[2]

1. Robertson, p. 260.
2. Polyb. 4.77–78. See Robertson, p. 261.

38. The Achaian League requests Megara to arbitrate between Corinth and Epidauros (242/1–238/7)

Two independent inscriptions, both from the Asklepieion at Epidauros.

I: h (max.): 0.26 m; w (max.): 0.345 m.

Hiller von Gaertringen, *IG* IV^2 1.70; M. Mitsos, *AE* 1937, pp. 708–14; *Schmitt 489. W. Peek, *ASAW* 60.2 (1969) pp. 23–25, no. 25, has added another fragment.

II: h: 1.43 m; w: 0.69 m; d: 0.18 m.

B. Staes, *AE* 26 (1887) cols. 9–24; F. Bechtel, *SGDI* 3025; J. Baunack and T. Baunack, *Studien auf dem Gebiete des griechischen und der arischen Sprachen* I (Leipzig, 1888) pp. 219–236; P. Kavvadias, *Fouilles d'Epidaure* I (Athens, 1891) 234; Dareste/Haussoullier/Reinach, *RIJG* I.16 (lines 1–32); Dittenberger, *SIG*^{2} 452; Michel 20; Fränkel, *IG* IV.926; Dittenberger/ Hiller von Gaertringen, *SIG*^{3} 471 (lines 1–32); Schwyzer 157 (lines 1–32); *Hiller von Gaertringen, *IG* IV^2 1.71; Buck 99 (lines 1–32); Daverio Rocchi 15.1 (lines 2–15).

Sonne 48; J. Baunack, *Philologus* 48 (1889) pp. 391–94; W. Wyse, *CR* 7 (1893) p. 17; Berard 11; J. Baunack, *Philologus* 54 (1895) pp. 44–48; A. Wilhelm, *GGA* 1898, p. 206; Phillipson, pp. 142–43; Raeder 50; Tod 15; Lécrivain, pp. 8–9; Steinwenter, p. 186; Robert, *REG* 1940, 53; *SEG* XI.402; J. Bingen, *BCH* 77 (1953) p. 624; *SEG* XIII.251, 281; Préaux, pp. 249–51; *SEG* XXIII.193; W. Peek, *ASAW* 60.2 (1969) p. 25, no. 26; J. Wiseman, *The Land of the Ancient Corinthians* (Göteborg, 1978) pp. 136–42; *SEG* XXVIII.389, 402; Austin 136; Daverio Rocchi pp. 156–61; Bölte, *RE* III.A.2 (1929) cols. 1592–99, s.v. "Speiraion."

I: The entrance of Epidauros into the Achaian League

ᵛ Ἀγαθᾶι τύχαι. [ἐπὶ στραταγοῦ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν Ἀράτου, ἐν δ' Ἐπιδαύρωι ἐπ'
ἱαρεῦς τοῦ Ἀσκλαπιοῦ - - - - ὁμολογία? τοῖς Ἐπιδαυ]-
ρίοις καὶ τοῖς Ἀ[χ]αιοῖς· [ἐ]ψαφίσθ[αι? - - - - - - - - -κα]-
θὰ ποτῆλθεν ποτὶ τὰν τῶν Ἀχαιῶν σ[ύνοδον? - - - - αὐτόνομοι? ὄν]-
τες καὶ ἀφρούρατοι καὶ πολιτεί[αι χρώμενοι τᾶι πατρίωι? - - - ἄνευ? ὅ]-
πλων παραπορευομένοις εἰς τὰ[ν - - - - - - - - - - - νό]-

vacat

μους δια[κ]ωλύον[τα]ς [- - - - - - - - - - - - - τῶν ἀρ]-
χείων τῶν ἐπὶ πό[λιος (or πολίων) - - - - - - - - - - - -]
ος νόμους καὶ ταῖς [δί]καις καὶ τα͡ῖ͡ς [- - - - - - - - - δι]-
καστηρίοις περὶ τ- -
καὶ περὶ γένεο(ς) κρίσιος καὶ περὶ τᾶν [- - - - - - - τῶν ἐγ]-
κλημάτων τῶν ποτ' ἀλλάλους κατὰ τὸ - - - - - - - - - - -

στάλας τὰς ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς τ̣ο̣ῖ̣ς̣ ανα[- - - - - - ά τῶν Ἐπι]-
δαυρίων βουλὰ ον- -
τῶν Ἐπιδαυρίων δυ- -
ναται καὶ τὰν χώραν ᾰ̣ . . . . αργι- - - - - - - - - - - - - -
μεν τοὺς Ἀχαιοὺς [- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - τοὶ]
Κορίνθιοι ἔχοντε[ς π]ρὸς τοὺς - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
. ν̣ ἀντιλέγοντι τοὶ Ἐπιδ[α]ύρι[οι - - - - - - - - - - - -]
[. . τ]οὶ Ἀχαιοὶ ηδ- -
. . . . . αι τοὺς ἐπὶ τ̣ας- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
[ἀποστελ?]λομένους μ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
[. . . 9 . . . ἀ]ποστελλ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
. . . . 13 . . . . λει- -
- -
- -
- -

Peek's fragment

. . . . . δε- -
. . . . . αν ἐν Ἐπιδαύρωι - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
. . . ει καὶ ὑπέχετ̣[αι - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
. . ᾰ̣ καὶ ἁ γενεὰ αὐ̣[τ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
κὰτ ταὐτὰ ποιείτω [- - - - - - - - - - - εἰ δέ κα - - - εἰς]
Ἐπίδαυρον γαμῆται, δ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
τῶν ἐν Ἀχαιίαι συναλ[λαγμάτων - - - - - - - - - - - κὰτ]
τοὺς τᾶς πόλιος νόμους [- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - τῶν]
συναλλαγμάτων ἁ κὰτ τ[- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - ὤι]-
κησε ἐν Ἐπιδαύρωι, ὑ̣στε[ρον δὲ - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
ἐν τᾶι βουλᾶι τῶν Ἐπιδα[υρίων - - - - - - - - - - - - τὰν]
μὲν συμπολίτευσιν μὴ σ[υγχωρῆσαι - - - - - - - - εἴ κα ἐμ]-
πολιτεύσηται κατὰ χρέος - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
. . ε̣ι ἔστε κα παύσητ[α]ι - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
- -

Peek's suggested restoration of 1: [ἐ]πὶ τοῖσδε [ἐπόης]αν [ὁμολογίαν τοὶ Ἀχαιοὶ καὶ τοὶ Ἐπιδαύριοι· συμπολιτείαν εἶμεν τοῖς Ἐπιδαυ]|ρίοις. || 3: ποτῆλθον: Peek (*sc.* τοὶ πρεσβευταί). ποτῆλθεν: *sc.* ἁ πρεσβεία: Mitsos. σ̣[ύνοδον] or σ̣[ύγκλητον]: Mitsos. || 5: παραπορευομένους εἰς τὰν πόλιν ἐλ[θ-]: Peek. || 5–6: [κατὰ νό]|μους διακωλύοντας π̣[ο]ρ̣ε̣ί̣α̣ς̣: Peek. || 7–8: [πόλι]|ος νόμοις: Peek. || 9: περί τε [τ]ῶν ἰαρῶ̣[ν κ]αὶ - -: Peek. || 11: κατὰ τοὺς: Peek. || 11–12: [καὶ τὰς]| στάλας τὰς ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς τ̣ο̣ῖ̣ς̣ ἀνα[τεθεῖσι]: Peek. || 13: ἵνα̣ [δὲ] γί[νηται π]ᾶσι κα̣-: Peek. || 14: δι[ότι] ἔ̣σ̣ται ἁ φιλία: Peek. || 14–15: [δύ]|ναται καὶ τὰν χώραν, ἂν τοὶ Ἀργεῖοι τ-: Peek. || 16: Ἀχαιοὺς II. . . .ΙΣΟΝ: Peek. || 17: Κορίνθιοι ἔχοντι [χ]ώρ̣α̣ς̣ τοὺς π̣-: Peek. || 17–18: [εἰ]| μὴ ἀντιλέγοντι: Peek. || 19: Ἀχαιοὶ ἢ ᾰ̣[ν]α̣χ̣ριθ̣-: Peek. || 21: [ἀποστελ]λομένους μὴ: Peek. || 23: . λει κ-: Peek.

II: Findings of the Megarian arbitrators

[Ἐ]πι στραταγ[οῦ τῶν] Ἀχαιῶν Αἰγιαλεῦς, ἐν δ' Ἐπιδαύρωι ἐπ' ἰαρεῦς
[το]ῦ Ἀσκλαπι[οῦ Δι]ονυσίου· κατὰ τάδε ἔκριναν τοὶ Μεγαρεῖς τοῖς
[Ἐπ]ιδαυρίοις καὶ Κορινθίοις περὶ τᾶς χώρας ἃς ἀμφέλλεγον, καὶ
[περ]ὶ τοῦ Σελλᾶντος καὶ τοῦ Σπιραίου, κατὰ τὸν αἶνον τὸν τῶν Ἀ-
[χαι]ῶν δικαστήριον ἀποστείλαντες ἄνδρας ἑκατὸν πεντήκοντα
[ἕν]α καὶ ἐπελθόντων ἐπ' αὐτὰν τὰν χώραν τῶν δικαστᾶν καὶ κρινάν-
[τω]ν Ἐπιδαυρίων εἶμεν τὰν χώραν, ἀντιλεγόντων δὲ τῶν Κορινθί-
[ων τ]ῶι τερμονισμῶι, πάλιν ἀπέστειλαν τοὶ Μεγαρεῖς τοὺς τερμο-
ν[ιξ]οῦντας ἐκ τῶν αὐτῶν δικαστᾶν ἄνδρας τριάκοντα καὶ ἕνα κα-
[τὰ] τὸν αἶνον τὸν τῶν Ἀχαιῶν. οὗτοι δὲ ἐπελθόντες ἐπὶ τὰν χώραν
ἐτερμόνιξαν κατὰ τάδε· ἀπὸ τᾶς κορυφᾶς τοῦ Κορδυλείου ἐπὶ
[τ]ὰν κορυφὰν τοῦ Ἁλιείου. ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἁλιείου ἐπὶ τὰν κορυφὰν τοῦ
[Κ]εραυνίου. ἀπὸ τοῦ Κεραυνίου ἐπὶ τὰν κορυφὰν τοῦ Κορνιάτα.
ἀπὸ τᾶς κορυφᾶς τοῦ Κορνιάτα ἐπὶ τὰν ὁδὸν ἐπὶ τὸν ῥάχιν τὸν τοῦ
Κορνιάτα. ἀπὸ τοῦ ῥάχιος τοῦ Κορνιάτα ἐπὶ τὸν ῥάχιν τὸν ἐπὶ ταῖ-
ς Ἀνείαις ὑπὲρ τὰν Σκολλείαν. ἀπὸ τοῦ ῥάχιος τοῦ ὑπὲρ τὰν Σκολ-
λείαν [ὑ]πὸ τὰς Ἀνείας ἐπὶ τὸν κορυφὸν τὸν ὑπὲρ τᾶς ὁδοῦ τᾶς ἁμα-
ξιτο[ῦ τᾶ]ς καταγούσας ἐπὶ τὸ Σπίραιον. ἀπὸ τοῦ κορυφοῦ τοῦ ὑπὲ-
ρ τᾶς [ὁ]δοῦ τᾶς ἁμαξιτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν κορυφὸν τὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ Φάγας. ἀπὸ
τοῦ κορυφοῦ τοῦ ἐπὶ τοῦ Φάγας ἐπὶ τὸν κορυφὸν τὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ Αἰγι-
πύρας. ἀπὸ τοῦ κορυφοῦ τοῦ ἐπὶ τᾶς Αἰγιπύρας ἐπὶ τὸν κορυφὸν
τὸν τ[οῦ] Ἀραίας. ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀραίας ἐπὶ τὸν κορυφὸν τὸν ὑπὸ τᾶι Πέτρ-
αι. ἀπὸ τοῦ ὑπὸ τᾶι Πέτραι ἐπὶ τὸν κορυφὸν τὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ Σχοινοῦν-
τος. ἀ[π]ὸ τοῦ κορυφοῦ τοῦ ὑπὲρ τοῦ Σχοινοῦντος ἐπὶ τὸν κορυφὸ[ν]
τὸν κατὰ τὰν Εὐόργαν. ἀπὸ τοῦ κορυφοῦ τοῦ ὑπὲρ τᾶς Εὐόργας ἐ[πὶ]
τὸν ῥάχ[ιν] τὸν ὑπὲρ τᾶς Συκουσίας. ἀπὸ τοῦ ῥάχιος τοῦ ὑπὲρ τᾶς
Συκουσίας ἐπὶ τὸν κορυφὸν τὸν ὑπὲρ τᾶς Πελλερίτιος. ἀπὸ τοῦ
[κ]ορυφοῦ τοῦ ὑπὲρ τᾶς Πελλερίτιος ἐπὶ τὸν κορυφὸν τὸν τοῦ Παν-
[ἰο]υ. ἀπὸ τοῦ Πανίου ἐπὶ τὸν ῥάχιν τὸν ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ὁλκοῦ. ἀπὸ τοῦ ῥά-
[χιο]ς τοῦ ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ὁλκοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν ῥάχιν τὸν ⟨ὑπὲρ⟩ τοῦ Ἀπολλωνίου. ἀπὸ
[τοῦ] ῥάχιος τοῦ ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἀπολλωνίου ἐπὶ τὸ Ἀπολλώνιον. Δικας-
[ταὶ τ]οὶ κρίναντες τοίδε· κτλ.

4: Σελλανύο[υ]: Staes, Bechtel, Baunack, *RIJG*, *SIG*^{2}, Michel, Buck. Σελλανύου: Berard. || 30: τὸν τοῦ Ἀπ[ολλ]ωνίου: Staes, *RIJG*, *SIG*^{2}, Michel. τὸν τοῦ Ἀπολλωνίου: *SIG*^{3}. Hiller von Gaertringen seems to credit Fränkel with the suggestion, but Bechtel, Kavvadias, and Baunack all added the necessary ὑπέρ. The rest of the inscription is taken up with the names of the 151 judges, arranged according to the three Dorian tribes: line 32: Ὑλλέων· (50 names); line 49: Πάμφυλοι· (51 names); line 67: Δυμᾶνες· (50 names). The smaller commission of 31 τερμαστῆρες τῶν αὐτῶν δικαστᾶν is also listed by tribe (lines 85–96).

Inscription II, dated by reference to Achaian and Epidaurian magistrates, records the decision of a panel of Megarian judges in a boundary dispute between Epidauros and Corinth. At the request of the Achaian League, to

which all three states at this time belonged, Megara delegated 151 citizens to investigate the ownership of Spiraion and Sellanys, the regions in dispute.[1] This tribunal went to the area and adjudged the territory to Epidauros. Both states apparently accepted the verdict in its general terms, but Corinth objected to the precise details of the boundary delimitation. As a result, again at the request of the Achaian League, Megara sent a further commission of 31 men, drawn from the original 151, which carried out another investigation of the territory. The decision of this second commission is recorded in lines 11–31 of the inscription, which define the border in detail by reference to roughly twenty landmarks along its length. This second demarcation was, as far as we can tell, final.

Although in this dispute it was Megara that acted as judge, this office was undertaken κατὰ τὸν αἶνον of the Achaian League, which probably means by a decree of the League council. There is no direct evidence that members of the Achaian League were obliged to submit their disputes to the League to be settled. But it does seem logical that there was some kind of implicit, if not explicit, expectation about arbitration of disputes between members.[2] And even if there was not always an agreement undertaken on entry into the League that new members would submit all possible future disputes to the League, in the case of Epidauros there is some evidence to indicate that provision was made when it entered the League to settle its existing disputes. Inscription I, which Hiller von Gaertringen thought recorded the initial arbitration mentioned in document II, has since undergone a revised reading by M. Mitsos.[3] Mitsos argued that the inscription is not in fact the first decision, the judgement that Corinth refused to accept, but rather the formal document relating to the entry of Epidauros into the Achaian League in 243. Included within the details of this agreement is a stipulation for arbitration of the specific disputes that Epidauros had outstanding with Corinth, perhaps as a condition of membership laid down by the League.[4] If this interpretation of inscription I is correct, it also allows us to date inscription II more closely. If the arbitration recorded in the latter was specifically provided for in the year 243, it seems likely that it would have taken place very shortly thereafter, perhaps in 242/1, the first possibility for the *strategia* of Aigialeus.

1. The date of this arbitration is fixed both by references to the involvement of the Achaian League and by the stoichedon style of the inscription. The *strategia* of Aigialeus may have been in 242/1, 240/39, 238/7, or perhaps 236/5.

2. Tod (pp. 74–75) believes that member states in the Achaian League were compelled; but it has been argued that the request for the services of the League in this case was completely voluntary : see Moretti, *ISE,* vol. 1, p. 131.

3. Mitsos, *AE* 1937, pp. 708–14.

4. *IG* IV^2 1.72 (**46**) should also be mentioned here: Kavvadias (*AE* 1918) relates it to the present inscription as well. For a similar case in which a state's entry into the Achaian League brought with it provision for the settlement of specific outstanding disputes, cf. **43**.

Although it seems a case may be made for the existence of some degree of obligatory arbitration in the Achaian League, this is not to say that all initiative was therefore removed from the disputing states; it is quite possible that they could express, for example, a desire for a specific state as arbitrator. In addition, the fact that Corinth was clearly not obliged to accept as final the first delimitation suggests that the parties had at least the freedom to appeal the details, if not the judgement as a whole. But it remains probable that the League would act as a guarantor of the final decision handed down, and it is unlikely that it would tolerate long-standing divisive disputes between its members.

The delegation of the actual duties of arbitration to a third member city by the League council seems to have been common enough practice. The geographical location of Megara no doubt played a large part in the choice of this city as arbitrator. Once it accepted the role, it was Megara's duty to choose the individuals who would act as judges. While 151 is a large number, it is by no means the largest number on record in a case like this.[5] An arbitral court consisting of as many individuals as this was usually indicative of a desire to take advantage of the justice and "common sense" of the people as a whole. We do not know how the court was chosen, but if it is true that the large number reflected a desire to make the court "democratic," it is possible that it may have been selected by lot.[6] On the other hand, a Megarian inscription of the same period, in which several of the names from the present inscription are repeated, suggests that these individuals at least were probably wealthy and perhaps prominent.[7] If so, it is likely that the arbitral court was appointed or elected rather than drawn up by lot. Both the original court of 151 judges and the smaller commission of 31 carried out a personal inspection of the region. The larger tribunal is only said to have gone to the area; the smaller is said to have actually determined the fixed points of the border enumerated in lines 11–31. The practical difficulties of accommodating and escorting 151 judges throughout a detailed investigation of the frontier could account for the reduction in numbers; it seems clear that the first group could not have carried out such a detailed inspection or demarcation. This may account for the Corinthian dissatisfaction, and the need for a smaller group to carry out a more leisurely and expert examination.[8]

5. In the long-standing dispute between Sparta and Messene, 600 judges from Miletos handed down a decision (**159**).

6. See Raeder, pp. 254–55.

7. The inscription (*IG* VII.42) is the dedication of a temple to Apollo, presumably an expensive undertaking. On the comparison of the names in the two inscriptions, see Staes, col. 21; *IG* IV.926, p. 202; *SGDI* 3025.

8. The most detailed discussions of the actual landmarks referred to in this inscription, some of which are mentioned by ancient authors, are those of Bölte and Wiseman.

39. Mantineia condemns Aratos and the Achaian League for an attack on Argos (240)

Plutarch *Aratos* 25.5.

Sonne 17; Berard 10; Phillipson, p. 144; Raeder 40; Tod, p. 59; Steinwenter, p. 182 n. 2; F. W. Walbank, *Aratos of Sicyon* (Cambridge, 1933) p. 56; A. Koster, *Plutarchi Vitam Arati* (Leiden, 1937) p. 80; W. H. Porter, *Plutarch's Life of Aratus* (Cork, 1937) p. lii; Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 1, p. 242; Larsen, *GFS*, p. 310; J. Mandel, *Athenaeum* 57 (1979) pp. 298–99; R. Urban, *Wachstum und Krise des achäischen Bundes* (Wiesbaden, 1979) pp. 61–62; Will, vol. 1, p. 337.

τῶν δὲ πολλῶν ἤδη διὰ συνήθειαν ἐθελοδούλως ἐχόντων καὶ μηδενὸς ἀφισταμένου πρὸς αὐτὸν, ἀνεχώρησεν, ἔγκλημα κατεσκευακὼς τοῖς Ἀχαιοῖς, ὡς ἐν εἰρήνῃ πόλεμον ἐξενηνοχόσι. καὶ δίκην ἔσχον ἐπὶ τούτῳ παρὰ Μαντινεῦσιν, ἣν Ἀράτου μὴ παρόντος Ἀρίστιππος εἶλε διώκων καὶ μνῶν ἐτιμήθη τριάκοντα.

In the year 240 Aristomachos, the tyrant of Argos, was assassinated by his slaves, and his son Aristippos II took power. Aratos took advantage of the opportunity to make an attempt to free Argos of the tyrant's dynasty and bring it into the Achaian League. He prepared a military expedition against Argos, using the resources of the Achaian League, and doubtless acting in his capacity as Achaian strategos. Aratos apparently expected the people of Argos to rise up and join him when his force arrived; however, they did not. Aratos was forced to retreat, leaving Aristippos in power. Furthermore, the abortive expedition furnished grounds to Aristippos for an accusation against the Achaian League, that they had initiated an act of war in a time of peace. He therefore brought a charge against the League before the Mantineians and won his case when Aratos did not appear to defend his actions.[1] Aristippos's victory in the suit took the form of a fine of 30 mnai, or half a talent, levied on the offending party. It is not clear whether the fine was ever paid.

The reason for the choice of Mantineia as arbitrator is obscure. Mantineia was apparently not affiliated with the Achaian League at this time, although it became so sometime within the next decade.[2] Presumably, then, it was perceived as a neutral judge. There is no mention of an ad hoc agreement between Argos and the Achaian League to choose Mantineia as an arbitrator. Plutarch's account is certainly too brief to be proof that there was *not* such a compromise. But what is more telling is the fact that Aratos failed to appear at the trial; indeed it is uncertain whether there were any Achaian representatives at all. The phrase δίκην ἔσχον ἐπὶ τούτῳ παρὰ Μαντινεῦσιν

1. On default see Steinwenter, p. 182. Cf. also the provisions in the arbitration treaty of the first century B.C. between Sardis and Ephesos (**170**, IV, lines 28–29).

2. Before 229. Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 1, p. 252; Larsen, *GFS*, p. 310; Will, vol. 1, p. 337.

may mean simply that they were accused (by Aristippos) before the Mantineian court, not that representatives of the Achaian League were actually present.[3] Aristippos had accused the Achaian League as a whole; and if the League had agreed to arbitration, the Achaians could no doubt have ensured that their strategos and/or other representatives would be present. It seems clear then that there was no ad hoc agreement to choose Mantineia as an arbitrator. But if there were no kind of arbitration agreement in effect at all, Mantineia's formal sentence against the Achaian League would be out of place. It may be that a past accord between Argos and the Achaian League called for arbitration, perhaps even specifying Mantineia as the arbitrating city. This hypothesis would account for the formal legalities of the arbitration taking place, even without the participation of one of the parties.

The fine imposed by Mantineia, half a talent, is a very small amount to award to a city that had suffered an armed attack. It is small enough that one might after all conclude that it was meant to be a personal fine against Aratos.[4] This is difficult to believe; the Achaians took part in the raid, and the Achaians were accused by Aristippos. We should conclude instead that the fine was deliberately nominal. Raeder thought that it was so because while Aratos had technically broken the peace, there were extenuating circumstances in that it was a tyranny that he was attempting to overthrow. Mantineia, while forced to find against Aratos for default, might nevertheless have preferred to offend Argos rather than the League, and therefore kept the fine to an absolute minimum.[5] It was not long after that Mantineia joined the Achaian League itself.

40. The Aitolian League arranges an isopolity between Messene and Phigaleia (c. 240)

Three separate inscriptions, all of them probably relating to the same set of circumstances.

I: Decree of Messene, discovered at Phigaleia. H: 0.49 m; w: 0.42 m; d: 0.09 m.

3. See Koster, p. 80.

4. This appears to be Tod's belief: "Aratus, though general of the Achaean League, appears to have acted on his own responsibility and consequently to have borne in person the penalty for his rash attempt" (p. 59). Although he does not address the issue directly, Tarn (*Antigonos Gonatas*, [Oxford, 1913] p. 404) appears to believe that it was the Achaians who were fined; he may, however, have been misled by his misconception that the fine was in the amount of 30 talents rather than 30 mnai.

5. See Raeder, p. 79; Walbank, *Aratos*, p. 56.

may mean simply that they were accused (by Aristippos) before the Mantineian court, not that representatives of the Achaian League were actually present.[3] Aristippos had accused the Achaian League as a whole; and if the League had agreed to arbitration, the Achaians could no doubt have ensured that their strategos and/or other representatives would be present. It seems clear then that there was no ad hoc agreement to choose Mantineia as an arbitrator. But if there were no kind of arbitration agreement in effect at all, Mantineia's formal sentence against the Achaian League would be out of place. It may be that a past accord between Argos and the Achaian League called for arbitration, perhaps even specifying Mantineia as the arbitrating city. This hypothesis would account for the formal legalities of the arbitration taking place, even without the participation of one of the parties.

The fine imposed by Mantineia, half a talent, is a very small amount to award to a city that had suffered an armed attack. It is small enough that one might after all conclude that it was meant to be a personal fine against Aratos.[4] This is difficult to believe; the Achaians took part in the raid, and the Achaians were accused by Aristippos. We should conclude instead that the fine was deliberately nominal. Raeder thought that it was so because while Aratos had technically broken the peace, there were extenuating circumstances in that it was a tyranny that he was attempting to overthrow. Mantineia, while forced to find against Aratos for default, might nevertheless have preferred to offend Argos rather than the League, and therefore kept the fine to an absolute minimum.[5] It was not long after that Mantineia joined the Achaian League itself.

40. The Aitolian League arranges an isopolity between Messene and Phigaleia (c. 240)

Three separate inscriptions, all of them probably relating to the same set of circumstances.

I: Decree of Messene, discovered at Phigaleia. H: 0.49 m; w: 0.42 m; d: 0.09 m.

3. See Koster, p. 80.

4. This appears to be Tod's belief: "Aratus, though general of the Achaean League, appears to have acted on his own responsibility and consequently to have borne in person the penalty for his rash attempt" (p. 59). Although he does not address the issue directly, Tarn (*Antigonos Gonatas*, [Oxford, 1913] p. 404) appears to believe that it was the Achaians who were fined; he may, however, have been misled by his misconception that the fine was in the amount of 30 talents rather than 30 mnai.

5. See Raeder, p. 79; Walbank, *Aratos*, p. 56.

S. A. Koumanoudes, *Philopatris,* 1 July 1859, no. 231; id., *AA* 1859, cols. 111f.; K. S. Pittakis, *AE* 1859, pp. 1823–24, no. 3493; LeBas/Foucart 328a; Cauer[2] 45; R. Meister, *SGDI* 4645; Berard 2, I; Dittenberger, *SIG*[2] 234; Michel 187; *Hiller von Gaertringen, *IG* V.2.419; Dittenberger/Hiller von Gaertringen, *SIG*[3] 472; Schwyzer 71; Schmitt 495; Daverio Rocchi 16 (lines 1–4, 9–12, 15–21).

II: Boundary regulations from Messene. No dimensions given.

W. Leake, *Travels in the Morea* (London, 1830) vol. 3, no. 46; C. Keil, *Analecta epigraphica et onomatologica* (Leipzig, 1842) 98;LeBas/Foucart 317a; Meister, *SGDI* 4646; Berard 2, III; *Kolbe, *IG* V.1.1430.

III: Boundary regulations from Messene. Two fragments of a tablet, inscribed on both sides (A and B). H: 0.25 m; w: 0.25 m.

J. Martha, *BCH* 5 (1881) p. 150, no. 1; R. Meister, *SGDI* 4647; Berard 2, II; *Kolbe, *IG* V.1.1429.

R. Weil, *MDAI(A)* 7 (1882) p. 211; Sonne 32, 40, 41; O. Hoffmann, *Die griechischen Dialekte* I (Göttingen, 1891–) pp. 20f.; E. Szanto, *Das griechische Bürgerrecht* (Freiburg, 1892) pp. 76f.; A. Wilhelm, *GGA* 165 (1903) p. 791; Hitzig 18; H. Swoboda, *Klio* 12 (1912) p. 34; Raeder 51; Tod 5, 6, 7; C. D. Buck, *CPh* 8 (1913) pp. 154–55; Hiller von Gaertringen, *AE* 1914, pp. 134f.; J. H. Thiel, *Klio* 20 (1926) p. 55; G. Klaffenbach, *IG* IX[2] 1, p. xxi; Flacelière, p. 240; Aymard, *PR,* p. 23 n. 39; Meyer, *RE* XIX.2 (1938) cols. 2082f.; Roebuck, Diss., pp. 66–68; *SEG* XI.1142; Walbank, *Comm,* vol. 1, p. 452; Préaux, p. 250 n. 1; Larsen, *GFS,* p. 203; Gauthier, pp. 366–68; Gawantka, pp. 67, 83, 88, 114, 212; Will, vol. 1, p. 332; Taeuber, p. 35; Walbank, *CAH* VII[2] I (1984) pp. 235, 250.

I: The isopolity decree

['Επειδὴ ἐπελθόντες ο]ἱ πρεσβευταὶ καὶ διαλύο-
[ντες οἱ παρὰ τῶν Αἰτω]λῶν Τίμαιος Κλεόπατρος
[. . . . . τό τε ψάφις]μα τὸ παρὰ τῶν Αἰτωλῶν ἀπ-
[έδωκαν καὶ αὐτοὶ] διελέγοντο ὅμοια τοῖς ἐν τ-
[ῶι ψαφίςματι ἀ]ξιῶντες διαλυθῆναι ποτὶ τὼ-
[ς Φιαλέας, συνπ]αρόντες δὲ καὶ τῶν ἐ Φιαλείας
[παρελθόντων] Θαρυκίδας 'Ονόμανδρος, Ἀνφίμα-
[χος, ...]λας, 'Ορθολαΐδας Κραταιμένης, Τι-
[. . . . . Δ]αμάρετος τὰ αὐτὰ ἀξίων, ἔδοξε τᾶι
[πόλει τᾶι Μ]εσανίων, ἦμεν τοῖς Μεσσανίοις κα-
[ὶ τοῖς Φια]λέοις ἰσοπολιτείαν καὶ ἐπιγαμία-
[ν ποτὶ ἀλλ]άλως, ποιήσασθαι δὲ καὶ συνβολάν, ἃ-
[νπερ δοκεῖ] ἀνφοτέραις ταῖς πολέοις, τὰν δὲ χ-
[ώραν καρπ]ίζεσθαι ἑκατέρως τώς τε Μεσανίω-
[ς καὶ τὼς Φι]αλέας, καθὼς καὶ νῦν καρπιζόμεθα·
[. . . . . κ]ᾳ ὁμολογήσωμες πὸτ [ἀ]λλάλως, ὁμό-

[cαι ἀνφοτέρω]c καὶ στάλας καταθέcθαι ἐν τοῖc
[ἱεροῖc, ὅπαι κ]ạ δοκεῖ ἀνφοτέραις ταῖc πολέο-
[ιc· εἰ δέ κα μὴ ἐμ]μένωντι οἱ Φιαλέες ἐν τᾶι φιλ-
[ίαι τᾶι πὸτ τὼc M]ẹcανίωc καὶ Αἰτωλώc, ἄκυροc ἔ-
[cτω πᾶcα ἁ ὁμολο]γία. ἔδοξε δὲ καὶ τοῖc Φιαλέ[ο]-
[ιc ποιεῖν καθ' ἃ ο]ἱ Μεccάνιοι ἐψαφίξαντ[ο. ὅρκ]-
[οc Μεccανίων· ὀμν]ύω Δία Ἰθωμάταν, Ἥρạ . . . . . .
. . . 14 . . . ον καὶ θεὼc ὁρκί[ωc πάντας· ἢ]-
[μὰν ἐμμεγεῖν . . .] ἐν τᾶι φιλί[αι τᾶι ὑπαρχώcαι]
[πὸτ Αἰτωλὼc καὶ Φι]αλέαc τ[οῖc Μεccανίοιc, . .]
. . . 15 . . . μεγ . . . 18 . . .

1–2: [Π]ρεcβε[υ]ταὶ καὶ διαλ[λακταὶ| Αἰτω]λῶν: Pittakis. [Ἐπειδὴ παραγε-νόμενο]ι πρεcβε[υ]ταὶ καὶ διαλυ|[ταὶ]: Cauer, Meister, Dittenberger, Michel. διαλυ|[ταὶ παρὰ]: Koumanoudes. In *AE* and *SIG*^{3} Hiller von Gaertringen (followed by Schwyzer) revised his opinion and followed Pittakis's original reading of διαλ^{vv}|[λακταὶ]. || 3: [κατὰ τὸ ψήφιc]μα: Pittakis. [ἔχοντεc τὸ ψάφιc]μα: Cauer. || 3–4: ἀπ|[οcταλέντεc δὲ] διελέγοντο: Pittakis. ἀπ|[οδόντεc τὸ ψάφιcμα] διελέγοντο: Cauer. || 5: διαλυθῆμεν: Plttakis, Cauer, Meister, Dittenberger, Michel, Hiller von Gaertringen (*SIG*^{3}), Schwyzer, Schmitt. || 6: ἐ[κ]: Pittakis. || 7: [πρεcβευτᾶν . . .]: Cauer. || 9: ἀξίων: Pittakis, Wilhelm, Hiller von Gaertringen (*IG*, *SIG*^{3}), Schwyzer, Schmitt. ἠξίων: Cauer, Meister, Dittenberger, Michel. || 12–13: ἃ|[ν κα δοκεῖ]: Koumanoudes, Cauer, Meister, Dittenberger, Michel. || 16: [ἃ δὲ καὶ δίκαι]α ὁμολογήcομεc: Koumanoudes, Pittakis. [ὁπόcα δέ κ]α: Foucart, Cauer, Meister, Dittenberger, Michel. [ὅcα δέ κα ἄλλ]α: Hiller von Gaertringen (*IG*, *SIG*^{3}), Schmitt. ὁμολογήcωμεν: Koumanoudes, Cauer. || 17: [ἀμφοτόρω]c: Pittakis. || 18: [ναοῖc ὅπωc κ]ὰ δοκεῖ: Pittakis. [ἱαροῖc]: Meister. [καθῶc κ]α δοκεῖ: Meister, Dittenberger, Michel. || 19: [ὅπωc δὲ παρα]μένωντι: Koumanoudes. [ὅπωc δ' ἂν ἐμ]μένωντι οἱ Φιαλέες ἐν τᾷ Φια[λίᾳ]: Pittakis. [ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἐμ]μένωντι: Foucart, Meister, Dittenberger, Michel. || 20: ἀκυρόcε: Pittakis. || 21: [αὕτα ἁ ὁμολο]γία: Cauer. [ἅδε ἁ ὁμολο]γία: Meister, Dittenberger, Michel, Hiller von Gaertringen (*SIG*^{3}), Schmitt. || 22: [τὰ αὐτὰ ἅπερ ο]ἱ Μεccάνιοι: Cauer. [καθάπερ ο]ἱ Μεccάνιοι: Meister, Dittenberger. || 23: [ὤμοcαν δὲ οὕτω ὀμ]νύω: Pittakis. || 23: Ἥρα[ν]: Cauer, Meister, Dittenberger, Michel, Hiller von Gaertringen (*SIG*^{3}), Schwyzer, Schmitt. Ἥρạ[ν] or Ἥρạ[κλέα]: Hiller von Gaertringen (*IG*). || 23–27: Ἥ|[ραν Ἐνυάλι]ον καὶ Θεὸc ὁρκ[ίουc| ἅπαντας τοὺc] ἐν τᾷ Φιαλίᾳ ὀ|[μνύειν τοὺc Φι]αλέαc [καὶ τοὺc ἐν| Μεccάνᾳ τοὺc] Με[ccανίωc]: Pittakis. || 25: [παραμενεῖν]: Koumanoudes. [ἐμμενεῖν ἡμᾶc]: Foucart, Michel.

II: Boundary regulations

- - - - - - - - - τὰν - - - - - - - - -
[- - - - ἐπ' εὐ]θείαc εἰ[c τὰν κράναν τὰν καλουμέναν]
[- - θέντ]ec τοὺc ὅρο[υc - - - - - - - - -]
[- - - M]eccάνιοι ἐκ τᾶν Δευκ- - - - - - - -
- - - - - ὕδωρ κοινὸν. vacare videtur

[- - - Ἄν]δρων Πατερίνου, Φιλ[ιστίων - - - - -]
- - - - -cηνος Φιαλεῦσι καὶ Μ[εccανίοις - - - - -]
- - - - -ν οἱ Μεccάνιοι κράναν τ[ὰν καλουμέναν - -]
- - - - - -αλος Φιλώτα, Αἴcχρων Τιμα- - - - -
[- - - - τῶ]ν ὅρων· τῶν [δὲ] ἀντιλεγομ[έ]νῳ[ν - - -]
[- - - τοὺ]c ὅρουc· ἀπὸ [δὲ] τοῦ κολωνοῦ τοῦ [καλουμένου Κρη]-
[cίου - - -]αι ἐπ' εὐθείας εἰc τὰν κρά[ναν τὰν καλουμέναν - -]
[cυμφώνως Μecca]νίοις, καθὼc τὰ caμεῖα [δεικνύει· ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ κολω]-
[νοῦ τοῦ καλουμ]ένου Κρηcίου, εἰ⟨c⟩ τὸ caμεῖ[ον - - - - - - -]
[- -ἀπὸ δὲ τούτο]υ εἰc τὰν κράναν τὰν κα[λουμέναν - - - -]
[καθὼc ἠξίωcαν οἱ Μecc]άνιοι.

[- - - - - - Ἄνδρων] Πατερίνου, Φιλιcτί[ων - - - - -]
- - - - - - - - - - Φιαλεῦσι καὶ Μecca[νίοις - - - - - -]
- - - - - - - - - - -αν ἀπὸ τοῦ κ[ολωνοῦ τοῦ καλουμένου]
[Κρηcίου - - - -αι ἐπ'] εὐθεία[c εἰc τὰν κράναν τὰν καλου]-
[μέναν -]

2: [εὐ]θείας ἐ[πὶ]: Meister. || 3: ἐc τοὺc ὅρο[υc]: Meister. || 10–11: [ἔκριναν περὶ τῶ]ν ὅρων· τῶν [δὲ] ἀντιλεγομ[έ]νω[ν ἐθήκαμεν τοὺ]c ὅρουc: Hiller von Gaertringen, *ap.* Kolbe. || 12: [ἐν τᾶι cτεφάν]αι: Hiller von Gaertringen, *ap.* Kolbe. || 14: εἴ τὸ caμεῖ[ον]: Meister.

III: Boundary regulations

A - - - - - - - -ει- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - κατὰ Δέραν- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
[- - κατ]ὰ τὸ κοῖλον εἰc τὰν κ[ράναν - - - - - - -]
[- - ὅπω]c οὖν τὰν χώραν με- - - - - - - - - - -
[- - - Μeccά]νιοι διὰ τὸ παράδειγμ[α- - - - - - - -]
[- - - ἀcφ]αλεῖc κτήcειc ἐν cτάλαι λ[ιθίναι - - - - -]
[- - Μecca]νίοις περὶ τᾶc [χ]ώρας ποτὶ Μεγ[αλοπολίτας]
[- τὰν ἐνιαυ]cίαν τῶν καρπῶν ἀπόλα[υcιν- - - - -]
[- - - - τᾶc] κρινομένας χώρας κα- - - - - - -
[- - - - τᾶc] κρινομένας χώρα[c - - - - - - -]
[- - - - - προ]γομία, ἃ ἔπραξε - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - -ἀγαθοῦ τοῦ - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - -ἀπὸ πρα- - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - - -c Μec[caν- - - - - - -]

B [- - - - - - - - - - - ἀcφάλειαν or ἀcυλίαν]
[καὶ πολέμω κ]αὶ εἰράνα[c· ὑπάρχειν δὲ αὐ]-
[τοῖc καὶ τ]ὰ [λ]οιπὰ τίμια [ὅca καὶ τοῖc]
[ἄλλοις εὐ]εργέταις· ἀν[αγράψαι δὲ τὸ ψά]-
[φιcμα τοῦ]το εἰc cτάλαν [λιθίναν καὶ ἐc τὰν]
[παραcτ]άδα τὰν ἐν ἀγο[ρᾷ - - - - - - - - -]
[. . . τῶν] Μeccανίων πε- - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - τὸ ἱερὸ[ν τᾶ]c - - - - - - - - - - -

vacat

['Επεὶ παραγενόμ]ενοι δικ[ασταὶ παρὰ τῶν - -]
[- - - - - - - - -κ]ράτης Ε- - - - - - - - - -
[- - - - - - - - -φ]ρονος, Τ- - - - - - - - - -
[- - - - - - - - - κ]ρίσει - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - -ίας - - - - - - - - - - -

2: κατ' ἄδειαν: Martha. κατὰ δὲ ῥαν: Meister. κατὰ δέραν: J. Bingen, *BCH* 77 (1953). || 4: χώραν Με[ccαν]: Meister. || 5: παραδέ[ξασθαι?]: Meister. || 5–6: [Φ]|ιαλεῖc: Meister. || 5–9: τοὺc| [Φ]ιαλεῖς κ⟨ρ⟩ίσεις [ἐ]ν⟨ε⟩στα⟨κ⟩ότα[c ἐκ τούτου Μεc|cα]νίοις περὶ τᾶς [χ]ώρας ποτὶ Με[γαλοπολίτας| εἶ]c τὰν τῶν καρπῶν ἀπόλα[υcιν τῶν ὄντων| ἐπὶ τᾶς] κρινομένας χώρας κα[ὶ]: Sonne. || 7: Με[γαλόπολιν]: Martha, with reservations. || 11: [ἐπι]νόμια: Meister.

The first of these inscriptions is the most historically significant, though they may all relate to the same event. The style of the inscription should place it in the third century, and it is generally dated to around the year 240. It records an isopolity agreement between the town of Phigaleia and Messene, Phigaleia's southern neighbour in the Peloponnese. This agreement was carried out under the auspices of the Aitolian League, which lent its services as mediator to the treaty. Not only were the three ambassadors (πρεcβευταὶ καὶ διαλύο|[ντεc])[1] from Aitolia to effect the official agreement between Phigaleia and Messene; they were also to settle outstanding disputes between the two. It may be that they did not act in a formal capacity as an arbitral court in these matters, but their task, as decreed by the Aitolian League, was described as persuading the Messenians to be reconciled with the Phigaleians (I, line 5: διαλυθῆμεν ποτὶ τὼc Φιαλέας). That this would have included settling a boundary dispute is made clear by lines 13–15. Some of the disputes may also have been private ones, between citizens of the two states, since arrangements were made for dealing with such disputes in a legal manner in the future (I, line 12: ποιήcαcθαι δὲ καὶ cυνβολὰν). The isopolity also provided for the joint use of a piece of contested territory that must have lain between Messene and Phigaleia. The two states were to use the land in common "as before"; the Aitolians may simply have been ratifying a previously existing, but perhaps legally unsatisfactory, situation.[2]

But in spite of this settlement there was apparently still some controversy over the borders between the two states. This continuing conflict was either settled at the time, perhaps even by the Aitolian delegation, or at a later date,

1. Whether the term to be restored here is διαλλακταί or some noun or participle from διαλύω is not central (see the *apparatus*); it is clear that part of the task of the Aitolian ambassadors was reconciliation of the two states.

2. Weil (p. 211) suggests that it was Phigaleia who had sought to encroach on the fruitful territory of Messenia to the south. Cf. Roebuck, Diss., p. 65.

possibly as late as the early second century.[3] The second document refers to both Messenians and Phigaleians, and even if it does not form part of the Aitolian reconciliation and settlement (there is no reference in it to Aitolians), it may be connected to the same rivalry between the two states. In inscription III, Martha, the original editor, restored the name of Megalopolis (very tentatively) and conjectured that this was in fact a dispute between Megalopolis and Messene. Nevertheless it was later shown that this was probably also a dispute between Messenia and Phigaleia, perhaps settled by Megalopolis.[4] It must be kept in mind that Martha himself, who suggested the restoration of Megalopolis, was very uncommitted to it.

In inscription II, there appear to be three separate boundaries drawn, although it is the same commission of arbitrators that does the work each time.[5] It is just possible that the reference to ὕδωρ κοινὸν should be related to the common land described in I, the isopolity agreement, although water, of course, makes a natural boundary and could easily be described as common to both sides. In the final inscription there is a reference to τῶν καρπῶν ἀπόλα[υσιν?] and to [ἐπι]νόμια; perhaps here, as in I, the issue is use of the land rather than ownership. If in fact we can date these two inscriptions to roughly the same period as inscription I, then they may be the specifications called for in the isopolity agreement (I, line 16: [ὅσα δέ κα ἄλλ]α? ὁμολογήσωμες), as the agreement itself had provided only a sort of general framework.[6]

41. Thyrrheion arbitrates the boundaries of Matropolis and Oiniadai (239–231)

The inscription is on the reverse side of the hollow bronze stele described in **33**.

G. Soteriades, *AE* 1905, pp. 57f., no. 2; Dittenberger/Hiller von Gaertringen, *SIG*^{3} 421B; Schwyzer 396; *Klaffenbach, *IG* IX^2 1.3B; Daverio Rocchi, pp. 118–19, no. 8.

A. J. Reinach, *JAN* 13 (1911) p. 236; Wilhelm, *Neue Beiträge* 1, p. 13; Tod 27; G. Klaffenbach, *Klio* 24 (1931) pp. 232–34; id., *IG* IX^2 1, pp. xxi, xxii; id., *SPAW* 1954 (1) pp. 23–24; *SEG* XV.359; Préaux, pp. 253, 260, 297; Larsen, *GFS*, pp. 197,

3. Meister claimed that both II and III belonged to the time and circumstances of the isopolity; see also Tod. Kolbe, however, dated inscription II to the second century, and Sonne dated III to the second century as well.

4. See Sonne, Swoboda.

5. Meister (*SGDI* 4646) and Kolbe (*IG* V.1.1430) divide the inscription into three sections: lines 1–8, 9–16, 17–20. The arbitrators are named at lines 6, 9, and 17.

6. See Schmitt, p. 184.

possibly as late as the early second century.[3] The second document refers to both Messenians and Phigaleians, and even if it does not form part of the Aitolian reconciliation and settlement (there is no reference in it to Aitolians), it may be connected to the same rivalry between the two states. In inscription III, Martha, the original editor, restored the name of Megalopolis (very tentatively) and conjectured that this was in fact a dispute between Megalopolis and Messene. Nevertheless it was later shown that this was probably also a dispute between Messenia and Phigaleia, perhaps settled by Megalopolis.[4] It must be kept in mind that Martha himself, who suggested the restoration of Megalopolis, was very uncommitted to it.

In inscription II, there appear to be three separate boundaries drawn, although it is the same commission of arbitrators that does the work each time.[5] It is just possible that the reference to ὕδωρ κοινὸν should be related to the common land described in I, the isopolity agreement, although water, of course, makes a natural boundary and could easily be described as common to both sides. In the final inscription there is a reference to τῶν καρπῶν ἀπόλα[υσιν?] and to [ἐπι]νόμια; perhaps here, as in I, the issue is use of the land rather than ownership. If in fact we can date these two inscriptions to roughly the same period as inscription I, then they may be the specifications called for in the isopolity agreement (I, line 16: [ὅσα δέ κα ἄλλ]α? ὁμολογήσωμες), as the agreement itself had provided only a sort of general framework.[6]

41. Thyrrheion arbitrates the boundaries of Matropolis and Oiniadai (239–231)

The inscription is on the reverse side of the hollow bronze stele described in **33**.

G. Soteriades, *AE* 1905, pp. 57f., no. 2; Dittenberger/Hiller von Gaertringen, *SIG*^{3} 421B; Schwyzer 396; *Klaffenbach, *IG* IX^2 1.3B; Daverio Rocchi, pp. 118–19, no. 8.

A. J. Reinach, *JAN* 13 (1911) p. 236; Wilhelm, *Neue Beiträge* 1, p. 13; Tod 27; G. Klaffenbach, *Klio* 24 (1931) pp. 232–34; id., *IG* IX^2 1, pp. xxi, xxii; id., *SPAW* 1954 (1) pp. 23–24; *SEG* XV.359; Préaux, pp. 253, 260, 297; Larsen, *GFS*, pp. 197,

3. Meister claimed that both II and III belonged to the time and circumstances of the isopolity; see also Tod. Kolbe, however, dated inscription II to the second century, and Sonne dated III to the second century as well.

4. See Sonne, Swoboda.

5. Meister (*SGDI* 4646) and Kolbe (*IG* V.1.1430) divide the inscription into three sections: lines 1–8, 9–16, 17–20. The arbitrators are named at lines 6, 9, and 17.

6. See Schmitt, p. 184.

267; Guarducci, *Epigrafia greca*, p. 554; P. Cabanes, *Ktema* 4 (1979) pp. 183–99; Thür, pp. 473, 483.

Στραταγέοντος Χαριξένου τὸ τέταρτον.
κρῖμα γαῖκὸν Στρατικοῦ τέλεος. τάδε
ἔκριναν Θυρρείων οἱ γαοδίκαι· ὅρια τᾶς χώ-
ρας Οἰνιά(δα)ις ποτὶ Ματροπολίταις τὸ δια-
5 τίχισμα (sic) καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ διατειχίσματος
εὐθυωρίαι διὰ τοῦ ἔλεος εἰς θάλας(σ)αν.
ἀναγραψάτω δὲ τὸ κρῖμα ᵛ πόλις τῶν Ο[ἰ]-
νιαδᾶν, πόλις τῶν Ματροπολιτᾶν ἐν
Θέρμωι ἐν τῶι ἱερῶι τοῦ Ἀπόλ(λ)ωνος.

4: ΟΙΝΙΑΛΛΙΣ. || 6: ΘΑΛΑΣΑΝ. || 9: ΑΠΟΛΩΝΟΣ.

This inscription records the decision given by a commission of Thyrrheian land judges in a border dispute between the Akarnanian towns of Oiniadai and Matropolis.[1] Although it is not stated explicitly, the Aitolian League probably should be understood to have been in some way involved in the arbitration. The document is dated by an Aitolian strategos, and the states involved were members of the Aitolian League. Perhaps Thyrrheion was delegated by the League to act as arbitrator in this matter; its status as an Akarnanian state currently a member of the Aitolian League, and a neighbour of the litigant states, would make the choice natural.[2] The boundary delimitation itself is brief and straightforward; the judges' decision was apparently made easier by the existence of a wall between the lands of the two states.[3] Both Matropolis and Oiniadai were to be responsible for the publication of the judgement at the temple of Apollo at Thermon.

The territory in dispute was in an Aitolian federal district named for the Akarnanian town of Stratos, west of the Acheloös. The region, a long strip lying along the west bank of the Acheloös, had been annexed by Aitolia, at some point after the treaty documented in **33**. It has been suggested in the past that the border regulation described in this case should be attributed to the period shortly after that treaty, when Aitolia and Epiros divided Akarnania between them.[4] The letterforms, however, appear to call for a greater lapse of time between the two documents. Klaffenbach has argued convincingly for a later

1. On the term γαοδίκαι see *RE* supp. III (1918) cols. 538–39, s.v. "γαοδίκαι"; and cf. **20**.

2. Klaffenbach (*SPAW* 1954) points out that it would be "inconceivable" that the Aitolian League would have a *free* Akarnanian state arbitrate, and therefore Thyrrheion must be a member of the Aitolian League at this time. However, cf. G. N. Cross, *Epirus* (Cambridge, 1932) p. 134 n. 2; and (against Cross) E. Kirsten, *RE* XVII (1937) col. 2213.

3. See Guarducci, *Epigrafia greca*, p. 554; and cf. **116**, line 28.

4. See Reinach, p. 236 (before 265); *SIG*^{3}, p. 659 (268); Préaux, p. 260 (268).

date, following the Aitolian invasion of Epirote Akarnania around 239–238.[5] At this time, or shortly thereafter, Thyrrheion would have been conquered, though it was lost to Aitolia again before 231.

42. A Ptolemaic official arbitrates between Arsinoë (Cilicia) and Nagidos (238–221)

A recently discovered inscription, probably from Cilician Arsinoë, now in the museum at Mersin. H: 0.813 m; w: 0.422 m.; d: 0.133 m.

E. Kirsten/I. Opelt, *ZPE* 77 (1989) pp. 55–66; *C. P. Jones/C. Habicht, *Phoenix* 43 (1989) pp. 317–46.

[Θρα]ϲέας Ἀρϲινοέων τῆι πόλει καὶ τοῖϲ ἄρχουϲι χαίρειν.
[ἐκ]ρμιϲάμεθα τὴν παρ' ὑμῶν ἐπιϲτολὴν καὶ τῶν πρεϲ-
[βε]υτῶν Ἀνδρομένουϲ καὶ Φιλοθέου διηκούϲαμεν ὑπὲρ τῶν
κατὰ τὴν χώραν. ἐπεὶ οὖν οἱ Ναγιδεῖϲ, ἐπακολουθήϲαντεϲ
5 τοῖϲ ὑφ' ἡμῶν παρακληθεῖϲιν, ἀφωρίκαϲιν ὥϲτε μηδεμιᾶϲ
ἀντιλογίαϲ ἔτι καταλειπομένηϲ ὑμετέραν εἶναι, καλῶϲ ποιήϲε-
τε ἐργαζόμενοί τε πᾶϲαν αὐτὴν καὶ καταφυτεύοντεϲ, ὅπωϲ αὐτοί τε
ἐν εὐβοϲίαι γίνηϲθε καὶ τῶι βαϲιλεῖ τὰϲ προϲόδουϲ πλείουϲ τῶν
ἐν ἀρχῆι γινομένων ϲυντελῆτε. καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ ϲπουδάζομεν περὶ
10 ὑμῶν καὶ βουλόμεθα τὴν πόλιν ἀξίαν τῆϲ ἐπωνυμίαϲ ποιεῖν, πᾶν τὸ
ϲυμφέρον καὶ χρήϲιμον ϲυνκατακευάζοντεϲ καὶ κοινῆι καὶ ἰδίαι τῶν
πολιτῶν ἑκάϲτωι. διὸ καὶ καλῶϲ ποήϲετε καὶ αὐτοὶ πολιτευόμεν[οί]
τε κατὰ τρόπον καὶ τὰϲ θυϲίαϲ τὰϲ εἰθιϲμέναϲ τῶι τε βαϲιλεῖ κ[αὶ]
τῆι βαϲιλίϲϲηι ϲυντελοῦντεϲ ἐν τοῖϲ καθήκουϲι καιροῖϲ. πε[πόμ]-
15 φαμεν δὲ ὑμῖν καὶ τὸ ἀντίγραφον τοῦ παρὰ τῶν Ναγιδέων ἀποϲταλέντοϲ
ἡμῖν ψηφίϲματοϲ ὑπὲρ τούτων, ὅπωϲ ἐπακολουθῆτε τοῖϲ γεγραμμένοιϲ·
τὰ δὲ πλείονα τοῖϲ πρεϲβευταῖϲ Ἀνδρομένει καὶ Φιλοθέωι ϲυνδιειλέ-
γμεθα, ἐντειλάμενοι ἀπαγγέλλειν ὑμῖν. [vac] ἔρρωϲθε. [vac]
Λεωϲθένηϲ ἐπεϲτάτει. γνώμηι προϲτατῶν, ἐπειδὴ Ἀετὸϲ Ἀπολλωνίου
20 Ἀϲπένδιοϲ καὶ ἡμέτεροϲ πολίτηϲ, ϲτρατηγὸϲ γενόμενοϲ κατὰ Κιλικίαν,
τόπον ἐπίκαιρον καταλαβόμενοϲ πόλιν ἔκτιϲεν Ἀρϲινόην ἐπώνυμον
τῆϲ μητρόϲ τοῦ βαϲιλέωϲ κ[αὶ κατώι]κιϲεν οἰκητὰϲ ἐν τῶι τόπωι καὶ τὴν χώ-
ραν ἐμέριϲεν οὖϲαν ἡμετέρα[ν], ἐκβαλὼν τοὺϲ ἐπινεμομένουϲ βαρβά-
ρουϲ, καὶ νῦν Θρακέαϲ ὁ υἱὸϲ αὐτοῦ, ἀποϲταλεὶϲ ὑπὸ τοῦ βαϲιλέωϲ ϲτρ[α]-
25 τηγὸϲ Κιλικίαϲ, ϲπεύδει τὴν πόλιν ἐνδοξοτέραν κατακευάϲαι καὶ [νῦν]
ἠξίωκεν τὴν χώραν τὴν δημοϲίαν [παρα]χωρῆϲαι τοῖϲ κατοικοῦϲιν ἔχ[ειν]
εἰϲ τὸν ἀεὶ χρόνον αὐτοῖϲ καὶ ἐκγόνοιϲ, βούλεται δὲ καὶ ἀρχεῖα καθίϲταϲ-
θαι κ[αὶ] νόμουϲ ἰδίουϲ [δοθῆν]αι? κ[αὶ τ]ὴν χώραν καταγραφῆναι αὐτοῖϲ εἰϲ

5. Justin 28.1.1. See Klaffenbach, *IG* IX^2 1, p. xxi; id., *SPAW* 1954; and Larsen, *GFS*, p. 267.

date, following the Aitolian invasion of Epirote Akarnania around 239–238.[5] At this time, or shortly thereafter, Thyrrheion would have been conquered, though it was lost to Aitolia again before 231.

42. A Ptolemaic official arbitrates between Arsinoë (Cilicia) and Nagidos (238–221)

A recently discovered inscription, probably from Cilician Arsinoë, now in the museum at Mersin. H: 0.813 m; w: 0.422 m.; d: 0.133 m.

E. Kirsten/I. Opelt, *ZPE* 77 (1989) pp. 55–66; *C. P. Jones/C. Habicht, *Phoenix* 43 (1989) pp. 317–46.

[Θρα]ϲέας Ἀρϲινοέων τῆι πόλει καὶ τοῖϲ ἄρχουϲι χαίρειν.
[ἐκ]ρμιϲάμεθα τὴν παρ' ὑμῶν ἐπιϲτολὴν καὶ τῶν πρεϲ-
[βε]υτῶν Ἀνδρομένουϲ καὶ Φιλοθέου διηκούϲαμεν ὑπὲρ τῶν
κατὰ τὴν χώραν. ἐπεὶ οὖν οἱ Ναγιδεῖϲ, ἐπακολουθήϲαντεϲ
5 τοῖϲ ὑφ' ἡμῶν παρακληθεῖϲιν, ἀφωρίκαϲιν ὥϲτε μηδεμιᾶϲ
ἀντιλογίαϲ ἔτι καταλειπομένηϲ ὑμετέραν εἶναι, καλῶϲ ποιήϲε-
τε ἐργαζόμενοί τε πᾶϲαν αὐτὴν καὶ καταφυτεύοντεϲ, ὅπωϲ αὐτοί τε
ἐν εὐβοϲίαι γίνηϲθε καὶ τῶι βαϲιλεῖ τὰϲ προϲόδουϲ πλείουϲ τῶν
ἐν ἀρχῆι γινομένων ϲυντελῆτε. καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ ϲπουδάζομεν περὶ
10 ὑμῶν καὶ βουλόμεθα τὴν πόλιν ἀξίαν τῆϲ ἐπωνυμίαϲ ποιεῖν, πᾶν τὸ
ϲυμφέρον καὶ χρήϲιμον ϲυνκατακευάζοντεϲ καὶ κοινῆι καὶ ἰδίαι τῶν
πολιτῶν ἑκάϲτωι. διὸ καὶ καλῶϲ ποήϲετε καὶ αὐτοὶ πολιτευόμεν[οί]
τε κατὰ τρόπον καὶ τὰϲ θυϲίαϲ τὰϲ εἰθιϲμέναϲ τῶι τε βαϲιλεῖ κ[αὶ]
τῆι βαϲιλίϲϲηι ϲυντελοῦντεϲ ἐν τοῖϲ καθήκουϲι καιροῖϲ. πε[πόμ]-
15 φαμεν δὲ ὑμῖν καὶ τὸ ἀντίγραφον τοῦ παρὰ τῶν Ναγιδέων ἀποϲταλέντοϲ
ἡμῖν ψηφίϲματοϲ ὑπὲρ τούτων, ὅπωϲ ἐπακολουθῆτε τοῖϲ γεγραμμένοιϲ·
τὰ δὲ πλείονα τοῖϲ πρεϲβευταῖϲ Ἀνδρομένει καὶ Φιλοθέωι ϲυνδιειλέ-
γμεθα, ἐντειλάμενοι ἀπαγγέλλειν ὑμῖν. [vac] ἔρρωϲθε. [vac]
Λεωϲθένηϲ ἐπεϲτάτει. γνώμηι προϲτατῶν, ἐπειδὴ Ἀετὸϲ Ἀπολλωνίου
20 Ἀϲπένδιοϲ καὶ ἡμέτεροϲ πολίτηϲ, ϲτρατηγὸϲ γενόμενοϲ κατὰ Κιλικίαν,
τόπον ἐπίκαιρον καταλαβόμενοϲ πόλιν ἔκτιϲεν Ἀρϲινόην ἐπώνυμον
τῆϲ μητρόϲ τοῦ βαϲιλέωϲ κ[αὶ κατώι]κιϲεν οἰκητὰϲ ἐν τῶι τόπωι καὶ τὴν χώ-
ραν ἐμέριϲεν οὖϲαν ἡμετέρα[ν], ἐκβαλὼν τοὺϲ ἐπινεμομένουϲ βαρβά-
ρουϲ, καὶ νῦν Θρακέαϲ ὁ υἱὸϲ αὐτοῦ, ἀποϲταλεὶϲ ὑπὸ τοῦ βαϲιλέωϲ ϲτρ[α]-
25 τηγὸϲ Κιλικίαϲ, ϲπεύδει τὴν πόλιν ἐνδοξοτέραν κατακευάϲαι καὶ [νῦν]
ἠξίωκεν τὴν χώραν τὴν δημοϲίαν [παρα]χωρῆϲαι τοῖϲ κατοικοῦϲιν ἔχ[ειν]
εἰϲ τὸν ἀεὶ χρόνον αὐτοῖϲ καὶ ἐκγόνοιϲ, βούλεται δὲ καὶ ἀρχεῖα καθίϲταϲ-
θαι κ[αὶ] νόμουϲ ἰδίουϲ [δοθῆν]αι? κ[αὶ τ]ὴν χώραν καταγραφῆναι αὐτοῖϲ εἰϲ

5. Justin 28.1.1. See Klaffenbach, *IG* IX^2 1, p. xxi; id., *SPAW* 1954; and Larsen, *GFS*, p. 267.

[μοίρ]ας?, ἔδοξεν τῆι βουλῆι καὶ τῶι δήμωι δοῦναι αὐτοῖς τὴν χώραν ᵛ
[τὴν δ]ημοσίαν καὶ τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν καὶ, ὅταν τινὰς ἄλλους Θρασέας
[ποτὲ] κατοικίζηι, ἐπαινέσαι Θρασέαν, καὶ τότε εἶναι αὐτοὺς ἀποίκους
[Ναγιδ]έων· συντελείτως[αν δὲ κ]αὶ [τὰς τ]ιμὰς τῶι βασιλεῖ καὶ Ἀρσινόηι
[καὶ Βε]ρενίκηι, πεμπέτωσαν δὲ καὶ φόρον, ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων ἀνηλωμάτων·
[πολι]τεύσονται δὲ καὶ χρήσονται νόμοις οἷς ἂν αὐτοὶ θῶνται, ἔστωσαν
[δὲ κ]αὶ ἰσοπολῖται Ναγιδέων· ἔστω δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ μετουσία παραγι-
[νομ]ένοις εἰς τὰ ἱερά· καὶ ἀπογραψάσθωσαν ἕκαστος εἰς φυλὴν
[ἣν ἄ]ν λάχηι, τελοῦντες τὸ γινόμενον· καλείσθωσαν δὲ καὶ οὗτοι
[ὅτ]αν τῆι Ὁμονοίαι ἡ πόλις θύηι, καὶ φερέτωσαν τὸ γι⟨νό⟩μενον· ὡσαύ-
[τ]ως δὲ καὶ ὅταν Ἀρσινοεῖς θύωσιν Θεοῖς Ἀδελφοῖς, παραγινέσθω-
[σ]αν Ναγιδεῖς φέροντες τὸ αὐτό· μὴ ἐξέστω δὲ μηκέτι ᵛ
[Ν]αγιδεῦσι παρευρέσει μηδεμιᾶι περὶ τῆς χώρας τῆς δοθείσης
[α]ὐτοῖς κατὰ ψήφισμα τοῦτο ἀμφισβητῆσαι, ἐὰν δέ τις ἄρχων προθῆι
[τι] δόγμα τ⟨οι⟩οῦτο ἢ ῥήτωρ εἴπηι, ὁ μὲν ἄρχων ἀποτεισάτω δραχμὰς μυρίας
ᵛ
[ἱερ]ὰς Ἀρσινόηι ἀπαραιτήτους, ὁ δὲ ῥήτωρ δραχμὰς χιλίας, καὶ ἡ γνώμη αὐ-
[τῶ]ν ἄκυρος ἔστω· ὅσα δ' ἂν ἀδικήματα ἴδια γένηται ἑκάστοις, ἐὰν μὲν ὁ
[Ἀρσιν]οεὺς ἐν Ναγίδωι τινὰ ἀδικήσηι ἢ ἀδικηθῆι, λαμβανέτω τὸ δίκαιον καὶ
[διδότ]ω κατὰ τοὺς νόμους τοὺς Ναγιδέων, ἐὰν δὲ ὁ Ναγιδεὺς ἐν Ἀρσινόηι
[τινὰ] ἀδικήσηι ἢ ἀδικηθῆι, λαμβανέτω τὸ δίκαιον καὶ διδότω κατὰ τοὺς
[νόμου]ς τοὺς Ἀρσινοέων, ἔστω δὲ αὐτοῖς πάντων τῶν ἀδικημάτων
[ἐξ οὗ ἂ]ν χρόνου γένηται τὸ ἀδίκημα προθεσμία ἐνιαυτός, ἐὰν δέ τις
[παρελθ]όντος τοῦ χρόνου γράψηται δίκην ἢ ἐγκαλέσηι, ἄκυρος ἔστω αὐ-
[τῶι ἡ δίκη]· τὸ δὲ ψήφισμα τοῦτο ἀναγράψαι εἰς στήλας λιθίνας δύο, ὧν
[τὴν μὲν] ἀναθεῖναι ἐν τῶι τῆς Ἀφροδίτης ἱερῶι, τὴν δ' ἑτέραν ἐν [Ἀρ]-
[σινόηι ἐ]ν τῶι Ἀρσινόης τεμένει, τὸ δὲ ἀνήλω̣μ̣[α τῶν στηλῶν με]-
[ρισάτω (e.g.) τ]ῆς μὲν ἐν Ναγίδωι ὁ ταμίας [ὁ Ναγιδέων, τῆς δὲ ἐν Ἀρ]-
[σινόηι ὁ τα]μίας ὁ Ἀρσινοέων. ᵛᵃᶜ

1: ἄρχουσιν: Opelt. || 16: ἐπακολουθῆτε: Opelt. || 18: Opelt omits the vacat before ἔρρωσθε. || 25: [ἐντιμ]οτέραν: Opelt. || 27–28: καθίστα|[σθ]αι: Opelt. || 28: δ̣ο̣ῦ̣ν̣α̣ι̣: Opelt. || 32: συντελείτωσαν α̣ὐ̣τ̣ο̣ί̣ ὡς ἡμᾶς: Opelt. || 33: Opelt omits ἰδίων. || 35–36: παρ' αὖτ[ικα| κατὰ γέ]νος: Opelt. || 40: μηκέτι τοῖς: Opelt. || 42: Opelt omits τις. || 43: [τὸ] δόγμα τοῦτο: Opelt. || 43–44: μυρίας ἰε|[ρ]άς: Opelt. || 45: Opelt omits ἴδια. γίνηται: Opelt. || 51–52: αὐ|[τή ᵛ?]: Opelt. || 54–55: τὸ δὲ ἀνήλωμα τῶν στηλῶν πλη|[ρωσάτω]: Opelt.

This inscription, published in 1989 for the first time, is almost completely intact. It was brought to the museum at Mersin from an unknown location, but the original editors conjectured that the stone's point of origin was probably Cilician Arsinoë, one of the parties involved in the events referred to in the inscription. Both the original editors and Jones and Habicht have provided thorough commentaries on this document. The present case is based chiefly on the definitive analysis provided by the latter.

The inscription consists of two separate documents. The first (lines 1–18) is a letter from one Thraseas, the Ptolemaic commander in Cilicia, to the city of Arsinoë. He was writing in reply to a letter and an embassy from Arsinoë. With this letter he enclosed the second document, a decree of the city of Nagidos, Arsinoë's neighbour (lines 19–56). In this decree were the regulations for Nagidos and Arsinoë's future relations. The relatively undamaged state of the inscription means that a fairly reliable version of events can be reconstructed from the two documents it contains.[1]

By 245, in the context of the Third Syrian War, Ptolemy III had reattached Cilicia to the Egyptian kingdom. At some point in the years after 238 Ptolemy's governor there was Thraseas. Thraseas was evidently pursuing a family tradition, as his own father, Aetos, a citizen of Aspendos, had been the Ptolemaic commander in Cilicia under Ptolemy II. Sometime during the reign of Ptolemy II and the Ptolemaic tenure of Cilicia (lost during the Second Syrian War) Aetos had founded the city of Arsinoë.[2] From the start Arsinoë seems to have had special, if not always congenial, relations with its neighbour Nagidos, a colony of Samos. For one thing, Arsinoë's *oikistes*, the Aspendian Aetos, also enjoyed honorary Nagidean citizenship (line 20); the later implications were that Nagidos was in some sense Arsinoë's mother city.[3] For another, Aetos, in founding Arsinoë, had taken away a portion of Nagidos's territory to donate to his new city. The territorial rivalry was at the heart of the dispute between Nagidos and Arsinoë that was settled by Aetos's son Thraseas several decades later. The Ptolemaic governor informs the Arsinoëans that, at his request, the Nagideans had delimited the territory, agreeing that it would go to Arsinoë and renouncing any future claims on it for themselves.

The land dispute itself was successfully over, and Nagidos was barred from ever seeking redress on the matter of the land. If any Nagidean should raise the issue in future and try to open the land dispute again, he risked a possible penalty of 1,000 to 10,000 drachmai. The lower of the two amounts was the penalty for a ῥήτωρ reopening the case; the higher was what a magistrate would be required to pay. The term ῥήτωρ presumably refers to an individual of private status; the higher penalty for a magistrate would be justified by his position as a public representative of the state. There is an analogous situation in **138**, a dispute between Troizen and the Peloponnesian Arsinoë, which was also settled by Ptolemaic officials. There both states were barred from renewing litigation; the penalty for doing so was 1,000 drachmai for an individual, 10,000 for a city.[4]

1. For the historical reconstruction see Jones, pp. 318–19; on the date see Habicht, pp. 335–36.

2. Habicht (pp. 336–37) suggests a date in the 260s for the founding of Arsinoë.

3. See Jones p. 318.

4. The fine payable by Nagidos if the case was reopened was to be made sacred to Arsinoë "no doubt as the goddess most injured by the infraction" (Jones, p. 327). Cf. Hiller

But other problems remained, which Thraseas also addresses in his letter. In the wake perhaps of the dispute with their neighbour, the Arsinoëans were not cultivating their land properly, and the public revenues had dropped. Not only was this harmful to Arsinoë's own civic economy, it was also interfering with its ability to forward the appropriate revenues due to the king. Thraseas was therefore anxious not only to settle the land dispute with Nagidos but also to see Arsinoë's public administration on a firmer footing. The second document, the decree of Nagidos, provides more details of Thraseas's arrangements. He had requested Nagidos to provide help in putting affairs in Arsinoë in order and to aid Arsinoë in its civic administration, at least in part through an isopolitical relationship with Nagidos. The Arsinoëans were to be considered colonists of Nagidos. Arsinoë would, however, remain an independent state, enjoying its own magistrates and laws. But the Arsinoëans were to be joint citizens of Nagidos and were to participate in its festivals.

Although the second document, the decree of Nagidos, predates Thraseas's letter to Arsinoë, we can still see Thraseas's mediation working behind the scenes to establish the relations of Arsinoë and Nagidos on a more congenial footing. This case provides a good example of the concerns and interests of the Hellenistic kings and their subordinates when it came to arbitration or mediation among the Greek city-states. Peaceful relations were sure to lead to profitable ones, in terms of goodwill and in terms of revenues.

43. The Achaian League calls for arbitration between Megalopolis and Orchomenos (after 235)

An inscription found near Orchomenos in Arkadia. H (max.): 0.63 m; w: 0.57 m.

P. Foucart, *RA* 32 (1876) pp. 96f.; LeBas/Foucart 353; Hicks 187; Dittenberger, *SIG*^{3} 229; O. Hoffmann, *SGDI* 1634; Michel 199; Hiller von Gaertringen, *IG* V.2.344; Dittenberger/Hiller von Gaertringen, *SIG*^{3} 490; Schwyzer 428; *Schmitt 499.

W. Dittenberger, *Hermes* 16 (1881) pp. 176–84, no. 3; *SEG* XI.1102; Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 1, pp. 220, 242; Larsen, *GFS*, p. 310; Taeuber, p. 35.

. . . . . παραβαίνῃ - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
μον πέμπηι εἴτε ἄρχω[ν - - - - - - - - - - - -]
πέοι εἴτε ἰδιώτας ψαφοφορέοι [- - - - - - - - - - ὀφλέτω]

---

von Gaertringen's contention (*AE* 1925–26, p. 74), with respect to the arbitration involving Peloponnesian Arsinoë (**138**), that potential fines would be deposited in a local temple of Arsinoë.

But other problems remained, which Thraseas also addresses in his letter. In the wake perhaps of the dispute with their neighbour, the Arsinoëans were not cultivating their land properly, and the public revenues had dropped. Not only was this harmful to Arsinoë's own civic economy, it was also interfering with its ability to forward the appropriate revenues due to the king. Thraseas was therefore anxious not only to settle the land dispute with Nagidos but also to see Arsinoë's public administration on a firmer footing. The second document, the decree of Nagidos, provides more details of Thraseas's arrangements. He had requested Nagidos to provide help in putting affairs in Arsinoë in order and to aid Arsinoë in its civic administration, at least in part through an isopolitical relationship with Nagidos. The Arsinoëans were to be considered colonists of Nagidos. Arsinoë would, however, remain an independent state, enjoying its own magistrates and laws. But the Arsinoëans were to be joint citizens of Nagidos and were to participate in its festivals.

Although the second document, the decree of Nagidos, predates Thraseas's letter to Arsinoë, we can still see Thraseas's mediation working behind the scenes to establish the relations of Arsinoë and Nagidos on a more congenial footing. This case provides a good example of the concerns and interests of the Hellenistic kings and their subordinates when it came to arbitration or mediation among the Greek city-states. Peaceful relations were sure to lead to profitable ones, in terms of goodwill and in terms of revenues.

43. The Achaian League calls for arbitration between Megalopolis and Orchomenos (after 235)

An inscription found near Orchomenos in Arkadia. H (max.): 0.63 m; w: 0.57 m.

P. Foucart, *RA* 32 (1876) pp. 96f.; LeBas/Foucart 353; Hicks 187; Dittenberger, *SIG*^{3} 229; O. Hoffmann, *SGDI* 1634; Michel 199; Hiller von Gaertringen, *IG* V.2.344; Dittenberger/Hiller von Gaertringen, *SIG*^{3} 490; Schwyzer 428; *Schmitt 499.

W. Dittenberger, *Hermes* 16 (1881) pp. 176–84, no. 3; *SEG* XI.1102; Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 1, pp. 220, 242; Larsen, *GFS*, p. 310; Taeuber, p. 35.

. . . . . παραβαίνῃ - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
μον πέμπηι εἴτε ἄρχω[ν - - - - - - - - - - - -]
πέοι εἴτε ἰδιώτας ψαφοφορέοι [- - - - - - - - - - ὀφλέτω]

---

von Gaertringen's contention (*AE* 1925–26, p. 74), with respect to the arbitration involving Peloponnesian Arsinoë (**138**), that potential fines would be deposited in a local temple of Arsinoë.

τριάκοντα τάλαντα ἱερὰ τοῦ Διὸ[ς τοῦ Ἀμαρίου, καὶ ἐξέστω τῶι βουλομένωι δίκαν]
[θ]ανάτου εἰσάγειν εἰς τὸ κοινὸν τ[ῶν Ἀχαιῶν. ˅ κατὰ τάδε ὀμνυόντων τὸν ὅρκον τὸν]
αὐτὸν οἱ Ὀρχομένιοι καὶ οἱ Ἀχαιοί, ἐμ μὲ[ν Αἰγίωι οἱ σύνεδροι τῶν Ἀχαιῶν καὶ ὁ στρα]-
[τ]αγὸς καὶ ἵππαρχος καὶ ναύαρχος, ἐν δ[ὲ Ὀρχομενῶι οἱ ἄρχοντες τῶν Ὀρχομενί]-
[ων·] ὀ[μ]νύω Δία Ἀμάριον, Ἀθάναν Ἀμαρίαν, Ἀφρ[οδ]ίτα[ν καὶ τοὺ]ς θ[εοὺς πάντας, ἢ μὰν ἐμ]
πᾶσιν ἐμμε[ν]εῖν ἐν τᾶι στάλαι καὶ τᾶι ὁμολογίαι καὶ τῶι ψαφίσματ[ι τῶι γεγονότι τῶι]
[κοι]ν[ῶι] τῶι τ[ῶ]ν Ἀχαιῶν· καὶ εἴ τίς κα μὴ ἐμμένηι, οὐκ ἐπιτρέψω εἰς δύναμ[ιν. καὶ εὐορ]-
[κέ]οντι μέν μοι εἴη τἀγαθά, ἐπιορκέοντι δὲ τἀναντία. ˅ τῶν δὲ λαβόντων ἐν Ὀρ[χο]-
[μενῶι] κλᾶρον ἢ οἰκίαν ἀφ' οὗ Ἀχαιοὶ ἐγένοντο μὴ ἐξέστω μηθενὶ ἀπαλ-
λοτριῶ-
[σα]ι ἐτέων εἴκοσι. ˅ εἰ δέ τι ἐκ τῶν ἔμπροσθε χρόνων ἢ οἱ Ὀρχομένιοι Ἀχαιοὶ ἐγέ-
[νον]το Νεάρχ[ω]ι ἔγκλημα γέγονεν ἢ τοῖς υἱοῖς, ὑπότομα εἶμεν πάντα, καὶ μ[ὴ]
[δικαζέ]σθω μήτε Νεάρχωι μηθεὶς μήτε τοῖς υἱοῖς αὐτοῦ μηδὲ Νέαρχος μηδὲ [τῶν]
[υἱ]ῶν αὐτοῦ μηθεὶς περὶ τῶμ πρότερον ἐγκλημάτων ἢ οἱ Ὀρχομένιοι Ἀχαιοὶ ἐγ[έ]-
[νο]ν[τ]ο· [δς δ]ὲ δικάζοιτο, ὀφλέτω χιλίας δραχμάς, καὶ ἁ δίκα ἀτελὴς ἔστω. ˅ περ[ὶ]
[δὲ τᾶς Νί]κας τᾶς χρυσέ[α]ς τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Ὁπλοσμίου, ἃν καταθέντες ἐνέχυρα οἱ Μεθυ[δρι]-
[εῖς οἱ μετοική]σαντες ε[ἰ]ς Ὀρχομενὸν διείλοντο τὸ ἀργύριον, καί τινες αὐτῶν ἀπήν[εγ]-
[καν εἰς Μεθύδρ]ι[ο]ν, ἐὰμ μὴ ἀποδιδῶντι τὸ ἀργύριον τοῖς Μεγαλοπολίταις, καθὼς ἐξ[ε]-
[χώρησεν ἁ πό]λις τῶν Ὀρχομενίων, ὑποδίκους εἶμεν τοὺς μὴ ποιοῦντας τὰ δίκαια. ˅

4: [βουλομένωι αὐτῶι δίκαν]: Foucart. || 9: [τῶι γενομένωι τῶι]: Foucart. || 11–12: Ὀρ[χομένωι γᾶν ἐπί]κλαρ[ο]ν: Foucart. Ὀρ[χομενῶι γᾶς] κλᾶρ[ο]ν: Dittenberger. Ὀρ[χομενίοις ἢ] κλᾶρ[ο]ν: Hoffmann. || 12–13: ἀπαλλοτριῶ|[σαι πλέον χρυσέ]ων: Foucart. ἀπαλλοτριῶ|[σαι ἐντὸς ἐτ]έων: Dittenberger. || 13–14: ἐγ[ένοντο, ἤ τοι] Νεάρχ[ω]ι: Dittenberger. || 14–15: μ[ηθὲν ἐγκαλεί]σθω: Foucart. || 17: [καὶ] ὅ[στις]: Foucart. || 18: [δὲ τᾶς τραπέζα]ς τᾶς: Foucart. || 19: [οἱ μεταστή]σαντες: Foucart. || 19–20: ἀπέ[φυγον, παρέχειν αὐτοὺς, ἐ]ὰμ: Foucart. ἀπέ[δοσαν, τινὲς δὲ οὐ· ἐ]ὰμ: Dittenberger. ἀπέ[φασαν ἀποδιδόναι· ἐ]ὰμ: Hoffmann. || 20–21: καθὼς ἐ[ψήφισται, τὰμ πό]λιν: Foucart. ἐ[παγγείλαντο ποτὶ τὰμ πό]λιν: Dittenberger. ε[ἰκός, ποτὶ τὰμ πό]λιν: Hoffmann.

It seems to have been common practice in the Achaian League to provide for judicial settlement of outstanding conflicts as individual cities joined. Megara was requested by the Achaians to arbitrate the land dispute between Epidauros and Corinth shortly after Epidauros entered the League (**38**). Some years later, when Argos joined, certain disagreements which that state had with Kleonai may have been settled through the offices of the League (**44**). The present document is the decree regulating the entrance of Orchomenos into the Achaian League, an event that probably took place shortly after 235.[1] Typical safeguards and provisions for legal action in case of transgression of the agreement appear.[2] However, there is an additional provision in this decree, one that could not have been typical of agreements between the Achaian League and new members, as it relates specifically to the unique circumstances of Orchomenos (lines 17f.). This special provision may well imply a potential arbitration by the League between the new member Orchomenos and a state that had joined the League in 235, Megalopolis.

Methydrion, one of the small towns from which the city of Megalopolis had originally been formed, had recently made a bid to reestablish its independence. The Methydrians, in need of money, had pledged a golden statue of a Nike in return for more easily spent silver. When Megalopolis brought Methydrion back into the fold, the leaders of the rebellion fled to Orchomenos, taking the money with them. Thus when Orchomenos joined the Achaian League shortly thereafter there was an outstanding dispute between it and Megalopolis, now its fellow member in the *koinon*. Megalopolis claimed the return of the money, and the Achaian League thereupon took part in this dispute. The League ruled, and Orchomenos agreed, that the money should be returned. If the money were not returned, however, then the parties involved were apparently to have the chance to argue the case in court. Strictly speaking, it was the Methydrian exiles who were held responsible, but as Orchomenos had undertaken to see that they would return the money, that state was also to be held liable. The most common form of arbitral action in the Achaian League seems to have been the delegation of a member state to carry out the details; this may have happened here.[3]

1. See F. W. Walbank, *CAH* VII^2 I (1984) p. 451.
2. Cf. the case of Epidauros, and *IG* IV^2 1.70, discussed in **38**.
3. Cf. **38**, **46**.

44. The Achaian League (?) calls for arbitration between Argos and Kleonai (c. 229?)

Eleven fragments of a limestone slab discovered at Nemea. H (combined): 0.53 m; w: 0.29 m; d: 0.16 m.

*D. W. Bradeen, *Hesperia* 35 (1966) pp. 323–26, no. 6; *SEG* XXIII.178.

C. Blegen, *AJA* 31 (1927) pp. 429–30.

. . . . ạν Κλε[ωναι- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
Κλεωναίων -
πολεμάρχοις τῶ̃[ν - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
ον τῶ̃ι τᾶι πόλει τᾶι Κ̣[λεωναίων - - - - - - - - -]
ἐπὶ τὰν περιάγηςιν καὶ τ̣α . . . . ε̣[- - - - - - - - ὀνό]-
ματα πατροφιστὶ τῶ̃μ παρεςομ[έ]ν̣[ων - - - - - - -. εἴ]
τίς κα παραγένηται εἴτε τῶν Κλεωναίω[ν εἴτε τῶν Ἀργείων - -]
κτουν τὰς ἀ ὁμολογία κελεύει· ἄλλος δ̣[ὲ - - - - - -πα]-
ρὰ τὸ δικαστήριον ἄγωνται ἕνεκεν τᾶ̃ς κ[- - - - - - -. εἰ]
δέ τις τῶν Ἀργείων ἢ τῶν Κλεωναίω[ν - - - - - - - - ἔ]-
στω δραχμᾶν χιλίαν. εἰ μέν κα τῶν Ἀρ[γείων - - - - κα]-
θὼς ὁ νόμος περὶ τῶν βιαίων καὶ φό̣ν̣[ου - - - - - - - -]
τᾶ̃ν πολίων τᾶν ἐν[ό]χαν α̣[- - - - - - - - - - - - μη]-
ν̣[ὸ]ς ὀγδόου τριαχ . . ιῳ̣ . . . ạτ- - - - - - - - - - - - -
ρ̣εος παραγένη[τ]αι ε̣ . . δικα- - - - - - - - - - - - - -
. ọ . ακαεθη̣ι τὸ κ . ιμ . . . ν̣ες- - - - - - - - - - - - - -
ν̣ῳ̣ . δώςοντι το . c- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
φον παρὰ τῶ̃μ πα̣ρ̣[αγεγονό]τ̣ῳ̣[ν - - - - - - - - - - -]
κα̣ . παρὰ τῶν π[αραγ]εγονότω[ν - - - - - - - - - - - -]
τοῦ cωτῆ̣[ρος Τ]ιμοκλείδα τ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
π̣ε[ί]θες[θαι εἰ]c τὸμ̣ ἐνιαυτὸ̣[ν - - - - - - - - - - - -]
καλό[μ]εθα πολί[τ]αν αὐτα νε- - - - - - - - - - - - - -
cκ[ε]ύει δίκας τα . ΦΑΡΑΕΙ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Δ . . αδ̣ . . . . ος Μεθίκοντος. - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
. . . ας Ἀρ[ιcτ]ομάχου. Ἐπηρε- - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Θεάςων Π[ο]λ̣εμάρχου. Νεω- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Πυθέας [. . . . . Ἀρ]ιcτόξεν[ος - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
Κα[λ]λ̣ . . . . . δωνος. Δ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Π̣υ̣ . . . . . ῳ̣cιμο- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
. . . . . ι- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Restorations suggested by Bradeen: 13–14: [μη]|ν̣[ὸ]ς ὀγδόου τριαχ[ος]ίῳ̣[ν cτ]ạτ[ήρων - -] or [μη]|ν̣[ὸ]ς ὀγδόου τριαχ[άδ]ι ῳ̣ . . . ạτ- -. || 15: ἐ̣[πὶ] or ε[ἰc] δικα[cτήριον]. || 25: [Ἀγί]ας Ἀρ[ιcτ]ομάχου.

Enough of this inscription remains to suggest that it consists of an agreement between the Peloponnesian states of Argos and Kleonai. The agreement seems

to have been established in order to settle the differences that the two states had with each other. There was probably some kind of boundary problem, as reference is made to a περιάγηcιc. The appearance of the term δικαcτήριον also suggests some kind of legal action and perhaps a judicial decision between the states. Bradeen suggested that the frequent appearance of forms of the word παραγίγνομαι, "the regular word for attendance at festivals," might indicate that one of the points at issue was the Nemean Games, a contentious matter between Kleonai and Argos. The two states were perpetual rivals for the right and honour of celebrating the sacred festival.[1]

Although the Achaian League appears nowhere in this inscription, the entry of Argos into the League in 229 may offer a reasonable date for an agreement between Argos and Kleonai, an agreement that settled, among other matters, the right of celebration of the Nemeia.[2] The inscription has been dated to the years around 230 on prosopographical as well as epigraphical grounds.[3] Furthermore, other cases discussed in this collection suggest that the Achaian League made a practice of settling outstanding conflicts between member states as those states joined the League (**38**, **43**). It is possible then that the League itself (or perhaps a delegated member state) arbitrated the differences between the new member (Argos) and the old (Kleonai) just as it had been involved in settling the differences between the new member Orchomenos, and the old, Megalopolis, around 234/3.

45. Border dispute between Megalopolis and Sparta (229–221)

I: Plutarch *Kleomenes* 4.1.
II: Polybios 2.54.3.
III: Part of the inscription discussed in **137** (*SIG*^{3} 665.19–21).

See the bibliography cited in **137**.

I: Plutarch *Kleomenes* 4.1

'Εκ τούτου Κλεομένη πρῶτον οἱ ἔφοροι πέμπουcι καταληψόμενον τὸ περὶ τὴν Βέλβιναν Ἀθήναιον. ἐμβολὴ δὲ τῆc Λακωνικῆc τὸ χωρίον ἐcτί, καὶ τότε πρὸc τοὺc Μεγαλοπολίταc ἦν ἐπίδικον.

1. The games were the subject of a later arbitration between Argos and Kleonai, carried out by Mummius in 145 (**152**).

2. See Bradeen, p. 326. Aratos had brought Kleonai into the League in 235 and celebrated a Kleonaian Nemeia; Argos, however, continued to maintain its right to hold the games.

3. See Bradeen, pp. 324f.

to have been established in order to settle the differences that the two states had with each other. There was probably some kind of boundary problem, as reference is made to a περιάγηcιc. The appearance of the term δικαcτήριον also suggests some kind of legal action and perhaps a judicial decision between the states. Bradeen suggested that the frequent appearance of forms of the word παραγίγνομαι, "the regular word for attendance at festivals," might indicate that one of the points at issue was the Nemean Games, a contentious matter between Kleonai and Argos. The two states were perpetual rivals for the right and honour of celebrating the sacred festival.[1]

Although the Achaian League appears nowhere in this inscription, the entry of Argos into the League in 229 may offer a reasonable date for an agreement between Argos and Kleonai, an agreement that settled, among other matters, the right of celebration of the Nemeia.[2] The inscription has been dated to the years around 230 on prosopographical as well as epigraphical grounds.[3] Furthermore, other cases discussed in this collection suggest that the Achaian League made a practice of settling outstanding conflicts between member states as those states joined the League (**38**, **43**). It is possible then that the League itself (or perhaps a delegated member state) arbitrated the differences between the new member (Argos) and the old (Kleonai) just as it had been involved in settling the differences between the new member Orchomenos, and the old, Megalopolis, around 234/3.

45. Border dispute between Megalopolis and Sparta (229–221)

I: Plutarch *Kleomenes* 4.1.
II: Polybios 2.54.3.
III: Part of the inscription discussed in **137** (*SIG*^{3} 665.19–21).

See the bibliography cited in **137**.

I: Plutarch *Kleomenes* 4.1

'Εκ τούτου Κλεομένη πρῶτον οἱ ἔφοροι πέμπουcι καταληψόμενον τὸ περὶ τὴν Βέλβιναν Ἀθήναιον. ἐμβολὴ δὲ τῆc Λακωνικῆc τὸ χωρίον ἐcτί, καὶ τότε πρὸc τοὺc Μεγαλοπολίταc ἦν ἐπίδικον.

1. The games were the subject of a later arbitration between Argos and Kleonai, carried out by Mummius in 145 (**152**).

2. See Bradeen, p. 326. Aratos had brought Kleonai into the League in 235 and celebrated a Kleonaian Nemeia; Argos, however, continued to maintain its right to hold the games.

3. See Bradeen, pp. 324f.

II: Polybios 2.54.3

'Εκβαλὼν δὲ τὰς φρουρὰς ἐκ τῶν ἐποικοδομηθέντων χωρίων ὑπὸ Κλεομένους κατά τε τὴν Αἰγῦτιν καὶ Βελμινᾶτιν χώραν, καὶ παραδοὺς τὰ φρούρια Μεγαλοπολίταις ἦκε πρὸς τὴν τῶν 'Αχαιῶν σύνοδον εἰς Αἴγιον.

III: The arbitration between Sparta and the Achaian League, after 163 B.C. (**137**)

αἳ τ' ἐν τοῖ[ς] Ἕλλασιν καὶ συμμάχοις γεγενημέ-
20 ναι πρότερον [κ]ρ[ί]σεις βέβαια[ι] καὶ ἀκήρατοι δ[ι]αμένωντι εἰς τὸ[ν] ἀεὶ χρόνον....

When Philip II carried out his settlement of the Peloponnese in 338, Megalopolis was one of the states to benefit from his reallocation of Spartan-held territory.[1] The lands in question were those known as Aigytis and Belminatis or Belbinatis. Both districts were of strategic significance and were perennial objects of dispute between Sparta and Megalopolis in the Hellenistic period.[2] Philip had given the Belminatis to Megalopolis, in a decision that was probably ratified by the *synedrion* of the League of Corinth, or by a judicial body empanelled from League representatives. Over a century later Kleomenes III seized the district forcibly from Megalopolis when he occupied the Athenaion in 229/8 at the beginning of his war with the Achaians and, later, Antigonos Doson. At this time the region was said to be ἐπίδικον, the object of a legal dispute. This may mean that at the time when Kleomenes invaded, the old matter of the ownership of the Belminatis had been submitted once again to litigation.[3]

Later in the war, when Antigonos had been invited in by Aratos, the Macedonian king forced the Spartans out of the Megalopolitan territory that they had occupied. Antigonos ejected the Spartan garrisons from the forts in the Belminatis and the Aigytis in 224 and handed these districts back to Megalopolis. This clearly cannot be construed as an arbitral settlement of the region; but the knowledge that these lands were the object of ongoing legal wrangling may have affected later views of the nature of Doson's settlement. It is possible, too, that Doson implemented certain policies of his forerunner Philip II in dealing with

1. See Piccirilli 60, and cf. **2**.

2. See Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 1, pp. 243–44, 255. The Belminatis also had a temple of Athena located within it, which may have increased its value as desirable territory; cf. **50** and the issue of the temple of Artemis Limnatis.

3. It may be that Plutarch was simply giving recognition to the eternally contested nature of the district; but the fact that he specifies that the territory was disputed "at that time" (τότε) indicates that the quarrel had once again found outward expression in legal action. The term ἐπίδικος certainly implies a judicial process.

the cases of both Megalopolis and Messene. After Sellasia the king may have invited his Greek allies to ratify the de facto situation with a de iure ruling. If so, the later inscription (from the years after 164/3) may make a reference to this. The κρίσεις may have been judgements passed by the Greeks after Sellasia on the status of the Aigytis and the Belminatis, and perhaps also Messene's Dentheliatis.[4]

46. The Achaian League arranges an arbitration between Arsinoë and Epidauros (after 228)

A stele, inscribed on both sides (A and B), found in the Asklepieion at Epidauros. H: 0.26–0.28 m; w: 0.19 m; d: 0.145 m.

P. Kavvadias, *AE* 1918, pp. 151–54, nos. 5, 5a; *Hiller von Gaertringen, *IG* IV^2 1.72.

F. Hiller von Gaertringen, *AE* 1925–26, p. 71, no. 7; J. Bingen, *BCH* 77 (1953) pp. 624–25; Robert, *REG* 1955, 105; W. Peek, *ASAW* 60.2 (1969) p. 25, no. 27; N. D. Robertson, *Hesperia* 45 (1976) p. 266 n. 29.

A Θεός
[ἐπὶ στρ]αταγοῦ τοῖς Ἀχαιοῖ[ς - - - - - - - - -]
. . . . . ος, ἐν δὲ Ἐπιδαύρωι ἐ[π' ἱαρεῦς - - - -]
[Ἐπιδαυ]ρίοις καὶ Ἀρσινοε[ῦσιν - - - - - - - - -]
. . . . . εν περὶ τᾶς χώρα[ς, ἃς ἀμφέλλεγον - -]
[κρίσις] ἔστω ἐπὶ τᾶς χώ[ρας - - - - - - - - - -]
[πόλεις] ἔνδεκα προβληθ[εῖσαι - - - - - - - - -]
. . . . . ᵛ Πελλάνα ᵛ Αἴγ[ιον - - - - - - - - -]
[Θελποῦ]σσα ᵛ οἱ δὲ λαχό[ντες - - - - - - - -]
. . . . . ς ἄχρι κα τρεῖς - - - - - - - - - - - - -
. . . . . ποιήσονται γ- - - - - - - - - - - - -
[ἐν δὲ τῶ]ι Τρίτωι μην[ὶ - - - - - - - - - - -]
[. . . . πα]ραγενέσθωσα[ν - - - - - - - - - - -]
[τῶν ἡρώ]ων ἢ θεῶν τι[μ - - - - - - - - - - -]
. . . . . εἰς τὰς πό[λεις - - - - - - - - - - -]
[. . . . . κ]αιρ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
. . . . . ταε- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

4. The Messenians claimed (50) that Antigonos's restoration of the Dentheliatis amounted to a judicial decision. On the inscription and whether it refers to κρίσεις made now or in 337, see 2. Cf. also Livy 38.34.8, also cited there: Livy evidently refers to a decision made in 337, but the erroneous appearance of the Achaians in this passage may have resulted from Livy or his sources confusing judicial settlements made in 337 (by the League of Corinth) with those made after Sellasia (perhaps by Doson's Hellenic League, the most prominent members of which were the Achaians).

the cases of both Megalopolis and Messene. After Sellasia the king may have invited his Greek allies to ratify the de facto situation with a de iure ruling. If so, the later inscription (from the years after 164/3) may make a reference to this. The κρίσεις may have been judgements passed by the Greeks after Sellasia on the status of the Aigytis and the Belminatis, and perhaps also Messene's Dentheliatis.[4]

46. The Achaian League arranges an arbitration between Arsinoë and Epidauros (after 228)

A stele, inscribed on both sides (A and B), found in the Asklepieion at Epidauros. H: 0.26–0.28 m; w: 0.19 m; d: 0.145 m.

P. Kavvadias, *AE* 1918, pp. 151–54, nos. 5, 5a; *Hiller von Gaertringen, *IG* IV^2 1.72.

F. Hiller von Gaertringen, *AE* 1925–26, p. 71, no. 7; J. Bingen, *BCH* 77 (1953) pp. 624–25; Robert, *REG* 1955, 105; W. Peek, *ASAW* 60.2 (1969) p. 25, no. 27; N. D. Robertson, *Hesperia* 45 (1976) p. 266 n. 29.

A Θεός
[ἐπὶ στρ]αταγοῦ τοῖς Ἀχαιοῖ[ς - - - - - - - - -]
. . . . . ος, ἐν δὲ Ἐπιδαύρωι ἐ[π' ἱαρεῦς - - - -]
[Ἐπιδαυ]ρίοις καὶ Ἀρσινοε[ῦσιν - - - - - - - - -]
. . . . . εν περὶ τᾶς χώρα[ς, ἃς ἀμφέλλεγον - -]
[κρίσις] ἔστω ἐπὶ τᾶς χώ[ρας - - - - - - - - - -]
[πόλεις] ἔνδεκα προβληθ[εῖσαι - - - - - - - - -]
. . . . . ᵛ Πελλάνα ᵛ Αἴγ[ιον - - - - - - - - -]
[Θελποῦ]σσα ᵛ οἱ δὲ λαχό[ντες - - - - - - - -]
. . . . . ς ἄχρι κα τρεῖς - - - - - - - - - - - - -
. . . . . ποιήσονται γ- - - - - - - - - - - - -
[ἐν δὲ τῶ]ι Τρίτωι μην[ὶ - - - - - - - - - - -]
[. . . . πα]ραγενέσθωσα[ν - - - - - - - - - - -]
[τῶν ἡρώ]ων ἢ θεῶν τι[μ - - - - - - - - - - -]
. . . . . εἰς τὰς πό[λεις - - - - - - - - - - -]
[. . . . . κ]αιρ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
. . . . . ταε- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

4. The Messenians claimed (50) that Antigonos's restoration of the Dentheliatis amounted to a judicial decision. On the inscription and whether it refers to κρίσεις made now or in 337, see 2. Cf. also Livy 38.34.8, also cited there: Livy evidently refers to a decision made in 337, but the erroneous appearance of the Achaians in this passage may have resulted from Livy or his sources confusing judicial settlements made in 337 (by the League of Corinth) with those made after Sellasia (perhaps by Doson's Hellenic League, the most prominent members of which were the Achaians).

B [δικασταὶ ἔκρι]ναν τοίδε
[Θελπ]ούcc[ιοι·] κτλ.

1: Θεὸc [τύχα ἀγαθᾶ]: Kavvadias. || 2: [. . . γραμματέος δὲ]|: Kavvadias. || 3–4: [ἔκριναν| Ἐπιδαυ]ρίοις: Kavvadias. || 6: [κρίcις]: Hiller von Gaertringen. || 10: ἄχρι Κατρειc-: Kavvadias. || 13: παραγινέcθωcαν: Peek. || 14: [τῶν ἡρώ]ων: Hiller von Gaertringen. θέων τι[c]: Kavvadias. || 16: IAIP: Peek. || 17: NTAI: Peek. The second side (B) would have carried the names of all the judges from the eleven cities; however, only the names of some of the judges from Thelpoussa have survived, in lines 20–33.

The arbitration recorded in this document relates to a disputed territory between the two states involved, Epidauros and its neighbour Arsinoë (Methana). The inscription is dated by reference to the Achaian League; and from the similarities to **38**, in form and content, it seems that the Achaian League was again involved in settling a dispute between its members. Both documents relate to arbitrations performed between and by cities that were members of the Achaian League in the latter half of the third century. As such they are dated by the Achaian *strategia* and, since both cases involve Epidauros, by the priesthood of Asklepios at Epidauros. Both, as in other cases of arbitration within the Achaian League and elsewhere, preserve the list of judges.[1] Here, as elsewhere, the actual boundary termination may have been preserved within the inscription; but virtually nothing of it is left.[2]

There is, however, one major difference between this arbitration and the previous one involving Epidauros and Corinth. There, one city, Megara, another member of the League, was chosen as the arbitrating state. Here, some eleven cities were delegated to send judges to settle the dispute, among them Pellana, Aigion, and Thelpoussa.[3] All of these states were also members of the League, confirming the notion that there was official League intervention. The eleven cities may have been proposed by the disputing states; if so, then the proposals were probably approved by the League council.

1. On the restoration [δικασταὶ ἔκρι]ναν τοίδε, cf. **36** and **38**.

2. Kavvadias thought (p. 154) that line 10, which he read as ἄχρι Κατρειc-, preserved a topographical name.

3. Hence, as far as the choice of arbitrators goes, the settlement of the Epidauros-Arsinoë dispute may have resembled more closely the situation in **36**. Perhaps, though, the names of eleven cities were put forward, and a selection (of three?) was made among them (cf. **92**, **170**).

47. An arbitration clause in a treaty between Eleutherna and Antigonos III (c. 224?)

A marble stele with pediment, perhaps found at Eleutherna in Crete; largely broken away on the left side. H (with pediment): 0.80 m; w (max.): 0.33 m; d: 0.08–0.13 m. Only the relevant portion of the thirty-five-line inscription is cited here.

G. Doublet, *BCH* 13 (1889) pp. 47–51, no. 1; F. Halbherr, *AJA* 11 (1896) pp. 582–86, no. 67; Guarducci, *IC* II.xii, pp. 158–61, no. 20; *Schmitt 501.

A. Scrinzi, *AIV* 7.9 (1897–98) pp. 1516f.; J. Delamarre, *RPh* 26 (1902) pp. 316f.; G. Cardinali, *RSA* 9 (1904) pp. 91–93; id., *RFC* 33 (1905) pp. 527–29; W. W. Tarn, *JHS* 29 (1909) p. 270; Wilhelm, *Attische Urkunden*, pp. 50f.; W. Bettingen, "König Antigonos Doson von Makedonien" (Diss., Jena, 1912) pp. 30–32; E. Pozzi, *MAT* 2.63 (1913) pp. 373–74; W. W. Tarn, *Antigonos Gonatas* (Oxford, 1913) p. 471; Tod 48; Muttelsee, p. 12; Steinwenter, pp. 193f.; de Taube, p. 41; G. T. Griffith, *Mercenaries of the Hellenistic World* (Cambridge, 1935) p. 69; S. Dow/C. F. Edson, *HSCPh* 48 (1937) p. 135; Heuss, pp. 141f.; van Effenterre, pp. 219f., 252; M. Launey, *Recherches sur les armées hellénistiques* (Paris, 1949–50) vol. 1, pp. 253f.; vol.2, pp. 753–54; M. T. Piraino, *AAPal* 4.13, fasc. 3 (1953) pp. 323f.; Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 1, pp. 280–81; *SEG* XXV.1028; Klose, p. 144; Gauthier, p. 323; Will, vol. 1, p. 389; K. Buraselis, *AE* 1981 (1983), pp. 115–25; Gruen, p. 99.

ἐὰν
[δὲ μὴ ἀποστείλωσιν τὴν β]οήθειαν ἐν τῶι γεγρα-
[μένωι χρόνωι οἱ κόσμοι οἱ Ἐλ]ευθερναίων ἢ τὴν
[συμμαχίαν λύωσιν τρόπωι ὁτ]ῳοῦν, ἀποτινέτωσα[ν]
[Ἀντιγόνωι δραχμὰς μυρίας] ἐν τῆι συναιρεθείσηι
[πόλει ἐκκλήτωι· κτλ. . .]

18: [ἀποστείλωσιν οἱ κόσμοι]: Doublet. || 19: γεγρα|[μμένωι κατὰ τὸ ψήφισμα τῶν Ἐλε]υθερναί[ω]ν: Doublet. || 20: [συνθήκαν λύωσιν]: Wilhelm, Guarducci. [παραγγελίαν τοῦ βασιλέως τρόπωι ὡτινι]οῦν: Doublet. || 21: [οἱ κόσμοι δραχμὰς μυρίας . . .]: Doublet. || 22: [ἐκκλήτωι πόλει]: Doublet.

The inscription on this stele contained an alliance between the Cretan city of Eleutherna and a Macedonian king Antigonos, probably Doson.[1] The section that has survived dealt with restrictions placed on the future alliances

1. There is no question that the Antigonos referred to here, and in the following case, must be either Gonatas or Doson, but there has been much disagreement about a more precise dating of this inscription. The weight of opinion is in favour of dating this to the reign of Antigonos Doson; the most plausible conjecture would assign both to a date around 224, the period when Doson was preparing to join the Achaian League in the war against Kleomenes III of Sparta.

of both parties and with mutual military aid. The balance of this aid seems to have been the responsibility of the Eleuthernaians; we can assume that the alliance was initiated by Macedon in the interests of acquiring a mercenary force.[2] Eleutherna was to be obliged to respond to a request for troops within a fixed period of time (twenty days), and to grant priority to Macedonian embassies, no doubt those sent to secure military assistance. If the magistrates of Eleutherna did not send troops within the prescribed period, or if the symmachy was broken by them in any other way, they were to pay amends to Antigonos. If the Macedonian ambassadors were not given priority, the Eleuthernaians were likewise liable to a prescribed penalty. Antigonos was also bound to send aid to Eleutherna within twenty days of a request, but no mention is made in the inscription of a penalty to be paid by Antigonos in case of default.

The section of the treaty cited here is the "arbitration" clause, which was to go into effect if the Eleuthernaians transgressed a provision of the alliance. A fine was to be paid to Antigonos; the final amount would be a matter for adjudication in an ἔκκλητος πόλις, which would have been decided upon by both parties.[3] But it does not appear in this case that the arbitrating city would have had quite the freedom of judgement that is apparent in some other cases. The payment of a penalty for default of obligations does not appear to have extended to Antigonos. Therefore, an arbitrator would be restricted to judging degrees of the guilt of Eleutherna; Antigonos would not be subject to any such arbitral ruling. Furthermore, the penalty that an arbitrator could inflict was already determined in the alliance; perhaps the ἔκκλητος πόλις would have the freedom to set the sum (up to 10,000 drachmai, almost 2 talents, the amount mentioned in the inscription). Beyond that, however, the arbitrators would probably not have much license.

48. An arbitration clause in a treaty between Hierapytna and Antigonos III (c. 224?)

Two separate fragments of a grey limestone stele (A and B), found at Hierapetros (Hierapytna), now apparently lost. A: h: 0.35 m; w (max.): 0.23 m; d: 0.10 m. B: h (max.): 0.28 m; w (max.): 0.20 m; d: 0.10 m. Only the relevant portion of the thirty-five-line inscription is cited here.

2. See Guarducci, p. 160; Klose, p. 144; Schmitt, p. 197.

3. See Wilhelm, p. 52. On the ἔκκλητος πόλις, cf. **13**, **74**. The term is restored in this inscription, based on its appearance in **48** (line 25) and the general similarity between the two treaties.

of both parties and with mutual military aid. The balance of this aid seems to have been the responsibility of the Eleuthernaians; we can assume that the alliance was initiated by Macedon in the interests of acquiring a mercenary force.[2] Eleutherna was to be obliged to respond to a request for troops within a fixed period of time (twenty days), and to grant priority to Macedonian embassies, no doubt those sent to secure military assistance. If the magistrates of Eleutherna did not send troops within the prescribed period, or if the symmachy was broken by them in any other way, they were to pay amends to Antigonos. If the Macedonian ambassadors were not given priority, the Eleuthernaians were likewise liable to a prescribed penalty. Antigonos was also bound to send aid to Eleutherna within twenty days of a request, but no mention is made in the inscription of a penalty to be paid by Antigonos in case of default.

The section of the treaty cited here is the "arbitration" clause, which was to go into effect if the Eleuthernaians transgressed a provision of the alliance. A fine was to be paid to Antigonos; the final amount would be a matter for adjudication in an ἔκκλητος πόλις, which would have been decided upon by both parties.[3] But it does not appear in this case that the arbitrating city would have had quite the freedom of judgement that is apparent in some other cases. The payment of a penalty for default of obligations does not appear to have extended to Antigonos. Therefore, an arbitrator would be restricted to judging degrees of the guilt of Eleutherna; Antigonos would not be subject to any such arbitral ruling. Furthermore, the penalty that an arbitrator could inflict was already determined in the alliance; perhaps the ἔκκλητος πόλις would have the freedom to set the sum (up to 10,000 drachmai, almost 2 talents, the amount mentioned in the inscription). Beyond that, however, the arbitrators would probably not have much license.

48. An arbitration clause in a treaty between Hierapytna and Antigonos III (c. 224?)

Two separate fragments of a grey limestone stele (A and B), found at Hierapetros (Hierapytna), now apparently lost. A: h: 0.35 m; w (max.): 0.23 m; d: 0.10 m. B: h (max.): 0.28 m; w (max.): 0.20 m; d: 0.10 m. Only the relevant portion of the thirty-five-line inscription is cited here.

2. See Guarducci, p. 160; Klose, p. 144; Schmitt, p. 197.

3. See Wilhelm, p. 52. On the ἔκκλητος πόλις, cf. **13**, **74**. The term is restored in this inscription, based on its appearance in **48** (line 25) and the general similarity between the two treaties.

G. Doublet, *BCH* 13 (1889) pp. 51–54, no. 2; F. Halbherr, *MusItal* 3 (1890) cols. 601–7, nos. 34a and 35a; Blass, *SGDI* 5043; Guarducci, *IC* III.iii, pp. 24–28, no. 1A; *Schmitt 502.

Tod 55; Robert, *REG* 1970, 472; *SEG* XXV.1033. For additional bibliography see the citations in **47**.

ἐὰν δ[ὲ μὴ ἀποστείλωσιν τὰν βοάθειαν ἐν τῶι γε]-
γρα[μ]μένωι χρόνωι ἢ τὰν c[υμμαχίαν λύωσιν τρόπωι ὁτωιοῦν, ἀποτινέτω]-
σαν οἱ κόσμοι δραχμὰς μυ[ρίας ἐν τᾶι συναιρεθείσαι πόλει ἐκ]-
25 κλήτωι. κτλ. . .

22: ἐὰν δ[ὲ μὴ ἀποστείλωντι αὐτὰν]: Halbherr. || 23: ἢ τὰν c[υνθήκαν]: Guarducci.

This inscription, bearing an agreement between the Cretan city of Hierapytna and Antigonos of Macedon, is virtually identical in substance to the document in the previous case, though it differs in phrasing. The historical circumstances surrounding this treaty were no doubt the same as those discussed in **47**. Here, as there, arbitration is provided for in case the Hierapytnians should not fulfill their commitments. Both Hierapytna and Antigonos were to provide a military force within thirty days of a request; but here, as in **47**, only the Cretan state was liable to a penalty for default of this obligation, or for any other breach of the agreement. The fine was again set at 10,000 drachmai, again to be paid in an ἔκκλητος πόλις. Although it is not specified that the fine was to be paid to Antigonos, it would have been handed over to him by the judges of the third state. Once again, we see the one-sidedness of the arrangements, and the narrow limits of the task allotted to the ἔκκλητος πόλις.

49. Byzantion tries to mediate between Achaios and Attalos I (222–220)

Polybios 4.49.2.

McShane, p. 65; Hansen[2], pp. 38–40.

Δυσηρέστει δ' αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ πᾶσαν προσενέγκασθαι φιλονεικίαν εἰς τὸ διαλῦσαι τὴν Ἀχαιοῦ πρὸς Ἄτταλον ἔχθραν καὶ τὸν πόλεμον, νομίζων κατὰ πολλοὺς τρόπους ἀλυσιτελῆ τοῖς αὐτοῦ πράγμασιν ὑπάρχειν τὴν ἐκείνων φιλίαν.

When the young Antiochos III came to the throne, his kinsman Achaios initially declared himself loyal to his king. But Achaios had in effect sovereign command of the western portion of what the Seleukids still considered to be their empire, and enjoyed such good fortune in his campaigns against Attalos

G. Doublet, *BCH* 13 (1889) pp. 51–54, no. 2; F. Halbherr, *MusItal* 3 (1890) cols. 601–7, nos. 34a and 35a; Blass, *SGDI* 5043; Guarducci, *IC* III.iii, pp. 24–28, no. 1A; *Schmitt 502.

Tod 55; Robert, *REG* 1970, 472; *SEG* XXV.1033. For additional bibliography see the citations in **47**.

ἐὰν δ[ὲ μὴ ἀποστείλωσιν τὰν βοάθειαν ἐν τῶι γε]-
γρα[μ]μένωι χρόνωι ἢ τὰν c[υμμαχίαν λύωσιν τρόπωι ὁτωιοῦν, ἀποτινέτω]-
σαν οἱ κόσμοι δραχμὰς μυ[ρίας ἐν τᾶι συναιρεθείσαι πόλει ἐκ]-
25 κλήτωι. κτλ. . .

22: ἐὰν δ[ὲ μὴ ἀποστείλωντι αὐτὰν]: Halbherr. || 23: ἢ τὰν c[υνθήκαν]: Guarducci.

This inscription, bearing an agreement between the Cretan city of Hierapytna and Antigonos of Macedon, is virtually identical in substance to the document in the previous case, though it differs in phrasing. The historical circumstances surrounding this treaty were no doubt the same as those discussed in **47**. Here, as there, arbitration is provided for in case the Hierapytnians should not fulfill their commitments. Both Hierapytna and Antigonos were to provide a military force within thirty days of a request; but here, as in **47**, only the Cretan state was liable to a penalty for default of this obligation, or for any other breach of the agreement. The fine was again set at 10,000 drachmai, again to be paid in an ἔκκλητος πόλις. Although it is not specified that the fine was to be paid to Antigonos, it would have been handed over to him by the judges of the third state. Once again, we see the one-sidedness of the arrangements, and the narrow limits of the task allotted to the ἔκκλητος πόλις.

49. Byzantion tries to mediate between Achaios and Attalos I (222–220)

Polybios 4.49.2.

McShane, p. 65; Hansen[2], pp. 38–40.

Δυσηρέστει δ' αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ πᾶσαν προσενέγκασθαι φιλονεικίαν εἰς τὸ διαλῦσαι τὴν Ἀχαιοῦ πρὸς Ἄτταλον ἔχθραν καὶ τὸν πόλεμον, νομίζων κατὰ πολλοὺς τρόπους ἀλυσιτελῆ τοῖς αὐτοῦ πράγμασιν ὑπάρχειν τὴν ἐκείνων φιλίαν.

When the young Antiochos III came to the throne, his kinsman Achaios initially declared himself loyal to his king. But Achaios had in effect sovereign command of the western portion of what the Seleukids still considered to be their empire, and enjoyed such good fortune in his campaigns against Attalos

of Pergamon that he decided to claim the royal title himself.[1] The continuing hostility between Achaios and Attalos was the subject of repeated mediation efforts on the part of the state of Byzantion. Polybios speaks of these attempts in the context of Byzantion's trade war with Rhodes and Bithynia (51). Byzantion's diplomatic endeavours were probably intended to gain the undivided support of Achaios and Attalos in its own conflict. These attempts to reconcile the two powerful individuals, Seleukid and Pergamene, were perceived as a threat by Prousias of Bithynia and are cited by Polybios as one cause of Prousias's entering the war against Byzantion on the side of Rhodes. But Byzantion's efforts to mediate between Achaios and Attalos were unavailing, as it apparently succeeded neither in reconciling the two nor in gaining support from them for its own war.[2]

50. Antigonos III supports Messene in a land dispute with Sparta (c. 222)

Tacitus *Annales* 4.43.1–3.

R. Weil, *MDAI(A)* 7 (1882) pp. 213f.; Sonne 51, 53; de Ruggiero, pp. 286–87; Berard 1; W. Kolbe, *MDAI(A)* 29 (1904) pp. 375f.; id., *IG* V.1 (1908) p. 260; Phillipson, pp. 162–64; Raeder 28; Tod 1; Steinwenter, pp. 184–86; Tod, *Sidelights*, pp. 49–53; J. V. A. Fine, *AJPh* 61 (1940) p. 155; Roebuck, Diss., pp. 62–64, 118–21; Robert, *REG* 1946–47, 114; Johnson et al., *ARS* 37a; Gruen, p. 98; Piper, p. 75; Daverio Rocchi, pp. 197–99; Hammond/Walbank, *Macedonia*, vol. 3, p. 362.

> Auditae dehinc Lacedaemoniorum et Messeniorum legationes de iure templi Dianae Limnatidis, quod suis a maioribus suaque in terra dicatum Lacedaemonii firmabant annalium memoria vatumque carminibus, sed Macedonis Philippi, cum quo bellassent, armis ademptum ac post C. Caesaris et M. Antonii sententia redditum. (2) contra Messeni⟨i⟩ veterem inter Herculis posteros divisionem Peloponnesi protulere, suoque regi Denthaliatem agrum, in quo id delubrum, cessisse; monimentaque eius rei sculpta saxis et aere prisco manere. (3) quod si vatum, annalium ad testimonia vocentur, plures sibi ac locupletiores esse; neque Philippum potentia, sed ex vero statuisse. idem regis Antigoni, idem imperatoris Mummii iudicium; sic Milesios permisso publice arbitrio, postremo Atidium Geminum praetorem Achaiae decrevisse. ita secundum Messenios datum.

1. According to Polybios (4.48).

2. See, however, Hansen (p. 40), who believes peace must have been established between the two by 220/19, since at that time both of them appear as Byzantion's allies. Against Hansen, see McShane, and 51.

of Pergamon that he decided to claim the royal title himself.[1] The continuing hostility between Achaios and Attalos was the subject of repeated mediation efforts on the part of the state of Byzantion. Polybios speaks of these attempts in the context of Byzantion's trade war with Rhodes and Bithynia (51). Byzantion's diplomatic endeavours were probably intended to gain the undivided support of Achaios and Attalos in its own conflict. These attempts to reconcile the two powerful individuals, Seleukid and Pergamene, were perceived as a threat by Prousias of Bithynia and are cited by Polybios as one cause of Prousias's entering the war against Byzantion on the side of Rhodes. But Byzantion's efforts to mediate between Achaios and Attalos were unavailing, as it apparently succeeded neither in reconciling the two nor in gaining support from them for its own war.[2]

50. Antigonos III supports Messene in a land dispute with Sparta (c. 222)

Tacitus *Annales* 4.43.1–3.

R. Weil, *MDAI(A)* 7 (1882) pp. 213f.; Sonne 51, 53; de Ruggiero, pp. 286–87; Berard 1; W. Kolbe, *MDAI(A)* 29 (1904) pp. 375f.; id., *IG* V.1 (1908) p. 260; Phillipson, pp. 162–64; Raeder 28; Tod 1; Steinwenter, pp. 184–86; Tod, *Sidelights*, pp. 49–53; J. V. A. Fine, *AJPh* 61 (1940) p. 155; Roebuck, Diss., pp. 62–64, 118–21; Robert, *REG* 1946–47, 114; Johnson et al., *ARS* 37a; Gruen, p. 98; Piper, p. 75; Daverio Rocchi, pp. 197–99; Hammond/Walbank, *Macedonia*, vol. 3, p. 362.

> Auditae dehinc Lacedaemoniorum et Messeniorum legationes de iure templi Dianae Limnatidis, quod suis a maioribus suaque in terra dicatum Lacedaemonii firmabant annalium memoria vatumque carminibus, sed Macedonis Philippi, cum quo bellassent, armis ademptum ac post C. Caesaris et M. Antonii sententia redditum. (2) contra Messeni⟨i⟩ veterem inter Herculis posteros divisionem Peloponnesi protulere, suoque regi Denthaliatem agrum, in quo id delubrum, cessisse; monimentaque eius rei sculpta saxis et aere prisco manere. (3) quod si vatum, annalium ad testimonia vocentur, plures sibi ac locupletiores esse; neque Philippum potentia, sed ex vero statuisse. idem regis Antigoni, idem imperatoris Mummii iudicium; sic Milesios permisso publice arbitrio, postremo Atidium Geminum praetorem Achaiae decrevisse. ita secundum Messenios datum.

1. According to Polybios (4.48).

2. See, however, Hansen (p. 40), who believes peace must have been established between the two by 220/19, since at that time both of them appear as Byzantion's allies. Against Hansen, see McShane, and 51.

In a passage that deals with deputations to Tiberius in the year A.D. 25, Tacitus tells of legations from Sparta and Messene who came to dispute their claim over a certain territory located on the border of the two states. This piece of land, lying on the western slopes of Taÿgetos and known as the Dentheliatis, contained a famous sanctuary of Artemis Limnatis. The ownership of this temple was the point of contention in this particular quarrel between the Spartans and the Messenians, a controversy that lasted for centuries.[1] The Spartan envoys to Tiberius, backing their argument with the evidence of historical records and the poets, claimed that the temple had been theirs from the days of their ancient ancestors, and that it had been lost to them when Philip II had taken it by force.[2] Almost three centuries later they had received it back again by rulings of Julius Caesar and Antony. The Messenians for their part appealed to a legendary past, claiming that the land had been given to them when the Peloponnese had been divided among the descendants of Herakles. They cited the poets and the histories, and inscriptions as well, as evidence to support their claim, and they defended Philip II's award of the land to them as a legal decision rather than an act of power. Philip's judgement had been upheld by an Antigonos, by Mummius when he was ordering the affairs of Greece in 146/5, by Miletos shortly after that, and by Atidius Geminus, the governor of Achaia. It was also validated by Tiberius himself. From the long list of consecutive decisions in favour of Messene, some of them apparently uninterrupted by any period of Spartan tenure of the land, it seems that Sparta may have tried to take advantage of any new turn of events, or the appearance of a new power to gain a new judgement in its favour: the pattern may also reflect repeated military action on the part of Sparta.

Tacitus does not tell us whom he means when he says "King Antigonos," and the sequence of judgements as it stands in his bald summary of the Messenian argument is such that it could refer to Monophthalmos, Gonatas, or Doson. Antigonos I is the least plausible choice for an arbitrator between Sparta and Messene. There is a greater possibility that Antigonos II was the king meant by Tacitus; he could have restored the Dentheliatis to Messene in the wake of the Chremonidean War.[3] Still, the weight of general opinion is in favour of seeing Antigonos Doson as the arbitrator mentioned by Tacitus.[4] The Dentheliatis could have been taken from Messene by Kleomenes and would then have been restored after Antigonos had defeated Sparta at Sellasia

1. For the Milesian settlement of the Messene-Sparta quarrel see **159**. The entry in Stephanos is a telling one: Δενθάλιοι· πόλις μία τῶν περιμαχήτων Μεσσηνίοις καὶ Λακεδαιμονίοις.

2. On the appeal to historical records and poets, see **26** and **74**. On the intervention of Philip II in this dispute (Piccirilli 61), see **2**.

3. See Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 1, p. 288; and Roebuck, Diss., pp. 62–64.

4. See Berard, Weil, Kolbe (*IG* V.1, p. 260), Raeder (p. 61), et al.

in 222.[5] In later years, it would have been in the Messenian interest to represent Antigonos's action as a legitimate judicial decision, just as they vociferously defended the legality of Philip II's arrangements.

51. Kavaros the Gaul mediates a peace between Byzantion, Rhodes, and Bithynia (220)

Polybios 4.51.9–52.4.

McShane, p. 65; Schmitt 516 (and cf. 514); Hansen[2], pp. 40–41; Will, vol. 2, pp. 45–46; Berthold, pp. 94–96; Ager, *Historia* 40 (1991) pp. 13–14.

Οἱ δὲ Βυζάντιοι τῶν ςφετέρων ἐλπίδων ἐψευςμένοι, τῷ πολέμῳ πονοῦντες πανταχόθεν, ἐξαγωγὴν περιέβλεπον εὐςχήμονα τῶν πραγμάτων. [52] Καυάρου δὲ τοῦ τῶν Γαλατῶν βαςιλέως παραγενομένου πρὸς τὸ Βυζάντιον καὶ ςπουδάζοντος διαλῦςαι τὸν πόλεμον καὶ διέχοντος τὰς χεῖρας φιλοτίμως, ςυνεχώρηςαν τοῖς παρακαλουμένοις ὅ τε Προυςίας οἵ τε Βυζάντιοι. (2) πυθόμενοι δ' οἱ Ῥόδιοι τήν τε τοῦ Καυάρου ςπουδὴν καὶ τὴν ἐντροπὴν τοῦ Προυςίου, ςπουδάζοντες δὲ καὶ τὴν αὑτῶν πρόθεςιν ἐπὶ τέλος ἀγαγεῖν, (3) πρεςβευτὴν μὲν Ἀριδίκην προεχειρίςαντο πρὸς τοὺς Βυζαντίους, Πολεμοκλῆ δὲ τρεῖς ἔχοντα τριήρεις ὁμοῦ ςυναπέςτειλαν, (4) βουλόμενοι, τὸ δὴ λεγόμενον, καὶ τὸ δόρυ καὶ τὸ κηρύκειον ἅμα πέμπειν πρὸς τοὺς Βυζαντίους. ἐπιφανέντων δὲ τούτων ἐγένοντο διαλύςεις ἐπὶ Κώθωνος τοῦ Καλλιγείτονος ἱερομνημονοῦντος ἐν τῷ Βυζαντίῳ.

Shortly before 220 B.C., the Byzantines, hard-pressed by the extortion of "protection" money they were paying to the Gauls who had settled around them, began to levy a toll on ships passing to and from the Black Sea (Polyb. 4.46). Among the powers affected by this Byzantine move was the trading nation of Rhodes, which served as a forum and champion for the complaints of all the other states involved. Diplomatic attempts to persuade Byzantion to abolish the duty failed. Rhodes declared war on the recalcitrant state, a war that expanded beyond the immediate interests of those concerned with the Black Sea trade route. Prousias of Bithynia, who had his own grievances against Byzantion, attached himself to the Rhodian cause.[1] Byzantion, for its part, was counting on the aid of the Seleukid usurper Achaios and was planning to unseat Prousias if possible by bringing in a rival claimant, Prousias's kinsman Tiboites

5. Dittenberger/Purgold, *IOlympia* 52 and p. 104; Kolbe, *IG* V.1, p. 260. There is no positive evidence for a Kleomenean seizure of the Dentheliatis, but on Kleomenes' military activity involving Sparta's contested northern borders see **45**.

1. Polybios lists the reasons in 4.49, among them the fact that Byzantion had been attempting to promote friendship between the Seleukid Achaios and Attalos of Pergamon, a friendship Prousias believed would not be in his own interests. Cf. **49**.

in 222.[5] In later years, it would have been in the Messenian interest to represent Antigonos's action as a legitimate judicial decision, just as they vociferously defended the legality of Philip II's arrangements.

51. Kavaros the Gaul mediates a peace between Byzantion, Rhodes, and Bithynia (220)

Polybios 4.51.9–52.4.

McShane, p. 65; Schmitt 516 (and cf. 514); Hansen[2], pp. 40–41; Will, vol. 2, pp. 45–46; Berthold, pp. 94–96; Ager, *Historia* 40 (1991) pp. 13–14.

Οἱ δὲ Βυζάντιοι τῶν ςφετέρων ἐλπίδων ἐψευςμένοι, τῷ πολέμῳ πονοῦντες πανταχόθεν, ἐξαγωγὴν περιέβλεπον εὐςχήμονα τῶν πραγμάτων. [52] Καυάρου δὲ τοῦ τῶν Γαλατῶν βαςιλέως παραγενομένου πρὸς τὸ Βυζάντιον καὶ ςπουδάζοντος διαλῦςαι τὸν πόλεμον καὶ διέχοντος τὰς χεῖρας φιλοτίμως, ςυνεχώρηςαν τοῖς παρακαλουμένοις ὅ τε Προυςίας οἵ τε Βυζάντιοι. (2) πυθόμενοι δ' οἱ Ῥόδιοι τήν τε τοῦ Καυάρου ςπουδὴν καὶ τὴν ἐντροπὴν τοῦ Προυςίου, ςπουδάζοντες δὲ καὶ τὴν αὑτῶν πρόθεςιν ἐπὶ τέλος ἀγαγεῖν, (3) πρεςβευτὴν μὲν Ἀριδίκην προεχειρίςαντο πρὸς τοὺς Βυζαντίους, Πολεμοκλῆ δὲ τρεῖς ἔχοντα τριήρεις ὁμοῦ ςυναπέςτειλαν, (4) βουλόμενοι, τὸ δὴ λεγόμενον, καὶ τὸ δόρυ καὶ τὸ κηρύκειον ἅμα πέμπειν πρὸς τοὺς Βυζαντίους. ἐπιφανέντων δὲ τούτων ἐγένοντο διαλύςεις ἐπὶ Κώθωνος τοῦ Καλλιγείτονος ἱερομνημονοῦντος ἐν τῷ Βυζαντίῳ.

Shortly before 220 B.C., the Byzantines, hard-pressed by the extortion of "protection" money they were paying to the Gauls who had settled around them, began to levy a toll on ships passing to and from the Black Sea (Polyb. 4.46). Among the powers affected by this Byzantine move was the trading nation of Rhodes, which served as a forum and champion for the complaints of all the other states involved. Diplomatic attempts to persuade Byzantion to abolish the duty failed. Rhodes declared war on the recalcitrant state, a war that expanded beyond the immediate interests of those concerned with the Black Sea trade route. Prousias of Bithynia, who had his own grievances against Byzantion, attached himself to the Rhodian cause.[1] Byzantion, for its part, was counting on the aid of the Seleukid usurper Achaios and was planning to unseat Prousias if possible by bringing in a rival claimant, Prousias's kinsman Tiboites

5. Dittenberger/Purgold, *IOlympia* 52 and p. 104; Kolbe, *IG* V.1, p. 260. There is no positive evidence for a Kleomenean seizure of the Dentheliatis, but on Kleomenes' military activity involving Sparta's contested northern borders see **45**.

1. Polybios lists the reasons in 4.49, among them the fact that Byzantion had been attempting to promote friendship between the Seleukid Achaios and Attalos of Pergamon, a friendship Prousias believed would not be in his own interests. Cf. **49**.

(Polyb. 4.50). When Rhodian diplomacy undercut the alliance between Achaios and Byzantion, and when Tiboites died a strangely fortuitous death, Byzantion began to seek a solution to the war.

It was at this juncture that Kavaros, the Gaulish ruler, arrived in Byzantion. His mission was to put an end to the conflict. Kavaros's action may have been influenced by familiarity with Greek ideas of arbitration and mediation, but his chief motive was no doubt the fact that the war was probably interrupting the flow of Byzantine "protection" money. His first act was to intervene between Prousias and Byzantion, both of whom agreed to his mediation. The Rhodians, on hearing of this, sent an embassy to Byzantion to partake in the settlement. It was with the efforts of Kavaros, then, that peace was made between the belligerents, probably in the autumn of 220. It may be that the treaties drawn up at the time were arbitrated by him.[2]

52. Several states try to mediate between Antiochos and Ptolemy in the Fourth Syrian War (219/8)

I: Polybios 5.63.4–7.
II: Polybios 5.67.11.

Huss, pp. 113f.; Will, vol. 2, pp. 29–30; Berthold, pp. 96f.; Ager, *Historia* 40 (1991) pp. 14–15.

I: Polybios 5.63.4–7

Κριθέντων δὲ τούτων οἱ περὶ τὸν Ἀγαθοκλέα καὶ Cωσίβιον ἐπὶ τοῦτο τὸ μέρος ταχθέντες ἐξέπεμπον ἐπιμελῶς τὰς πρεσβείας πρὸς τὸν Ἀντίοχον. (5) ἅμα δὲ διαπεμψάμενοι πρός τε Ῥοδίους καὶ Βυζαντίους καὶ Κυζικηνούς, cὺν δὲ τούτοις Αἰτωλούς, ἐπεσπάσαντο πρεσβείας ἐπὶ τὰς διαλύσεις, (6) αἳ καὶ παραγενόμεναι μεγάλας αὐτοῖς ἔδοσαν ἀφορμάς, διαπρεσβευόμεναι πρὸς ἀμφοτέρους τοὺς βασιλεῖς, εἰς τὸ λαβεῖν ἀναστροφὴν καὶ χρόνον πρὸς τὰς τοῦ πολέμου παρασκευάς. (7) ταύταις τε δὴ κατὰ τὸ cυνεχὲς ἐχρημάτιζον ἐν τῇ Μέμφει προκαθήμενοι, παραπλησίως δὲ καὶ τὰς παρὰ τῶν περὶ τὸν Ἀντίοχον ἀπεδέχοντο, φιλανθρώπως ποιούμενοι τὰς ἀπαντήσεις.

II: Polybios 5.67.11

Ἐλέγετο μὲν οὖν ταῦτα καὶ παραπλήσια τούτοις πλεονάκις ὑπ' ἀμφοτέρων κατὰ τὰς διαπρεσβείας καὶ τὰς ἐντεύξεις, ἐπετελεῖτο δὲ τὸ παράπαν οὐδὲν

2. See C. Habicht, *RE* XXIII.1 (1957) cols. 1089–91, s.v. "Prusias." Terms of the treaties: Polyb. 4.52. See Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 1, pp. 506–7; Schmitt 516.

(Polyb. 4.50). When Rhodian diplomacy undercut the alliance between Achaios and Byzantion, and when Tiboites died a strangely fortuitous death, Byzantion began to seek a solution to the war.

It was at this juncture that Kavaros, the Gaulish ruler, arrived in Byzantion. His mission was to put an end to the conflict. Kavaros's action may have been influenced by familiarity with Greek ideas of arbitration and mediation, but his chief motive was no doubt the fact that the war was probably interrupting the flow of Byzantine "protection" money. His first act was to intervene between Prousias and Byzantion, both of whom agreed to his mediation. The Rhodians, on hearing of this, sent an embassy to Byzantion to partake in the settlement. It was with the efforts of Kavaros, then, that peace was made between the belligerents, probably in the autumn of 220. It may be that the treaties drawn up at the time were arbitrated by him.[2]

52. Several states try to mediate between Antiochos and Ptolemy in the Fourth Syrian War (219/8)

I: Polybios 5.63.4–7.
II: Polybios 5.67.11.

Huss, pp. 113f.; Will, vol. 2, pp. 29–30; Berthold, pp. 96f.; Ager, *Historia* 40 (1991) pp. 14–15.

I: Polybios 5.63.4–7

Κριθέντων δὲ τούτων οἱ περὶ τὸν Ἀγαθοκλέα καὶ Cωσίβιον ἐπὶ τοῦτο τὸ μέρος ταχθέντες ἐξέπεμπον ἐπιμελῶς τὰς πρεσβείας πρὸς τὸν Ἀντίοχον. (5) ἅμα δὲ διαπεμψάμενοι πρός τε Ῥοδίους καὶ Βυζαντίους καὶ Κυζικηνούς, cὺν δὲ τούτοις Αἰτωλούς, ἐπεσπάσαντο πρεσβείας ἐπὶ τὰς διαλύσεις, (6) αἳ καὶ παραγενόμεναι μεγάλας αὐτοῖς ἔδοσαν ἀφορμάς, διαπρεσβευόμεναι πρὸς ἀμφοτέρους τοὺς βασιλεῖς, εἰς τὸ λαβεῖν ἀναστροφὴν καὶ χρόνον πρὸς τὰς τοῦ πολέμου παρασκευάς. (7) ταύταις τε δὴ κατὰ τὸ cυνεχὲς ἐχρημάτιζον ἐν τῇ Μέμφει προκαθήμενοι, παραπλησίως δὲ καὶ τὰς παρὰ τῶν περὶ τὸν Ἀντίοχον ἀπεδέχοντο, φιλανθρώπως ποιούμενοι τὰς ἀπαντήσεις.

II: Polybios 5.67.11

Ἐλέγετο μὲν οὖν ταῦτα καὶ παραπλήσια τούτοις πλεονάκις ὑπ' ἀμφοτέρων κατὰ τὰς διαπρεσβείας καὶ τὰς ἐντεύξεις, ἐπετελεῖτο δὲ τὸ παράπαν οὐδὲν

2. See C. Habicht, *RE* XXIII.1 (1957) cols. 1089–91, s.v. "Prusias." Terms of the treaties: Polyb. 4.52. See Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 1, pp. 506–7; Schmitt 516.

ἅτε τῆς διχαιολογίας γινομένης διὰ τῶν κοινῶν φίλων, μεταξὺ δὲ μηδενὸς ὑπάρχοντος τοῦ δυνησομένου παρακατασχεῖν καὶ κωλῦσαι τὴν τοῦ δοκοῦντος ἀδικεῖν ὁρμήν.

In the winter of 219/8, in order to counter the threat posed by the aggression of Antiochos III, Ptolemy IV's ministers Sosibios and Agathokles began to build up Egypt's military strength secretly through innovative, if desperate, measures. But it was necessary to lull Antiochos into temporary inactivity himself, and so, according to Polybios, they invited mutual friends of Antiochos and Ptolemy to carry out mediation between the two belligerents. Embassies were sent to Rhodes, Byzantion, Kyzikos, and the Aitolians, asking them to conduct negotiations.[1] The delay in the fighting caused by the mediation of these states worked to the advantage of Egypt. Polybios implies that Antiochos and the mediators themselves were acting in good faith, but that Sosibios and Agathokles were merely using the negotiations as a smoke screen for their real activities.[2]

The negotiations were carried out during a four-month armistice in the winter of 219/8. Antiochos wintered in northern Syria, in Seleukeia, where the mediators were called upon not only to try to reconcile the two parties but also to listen to putative legal aspects of the case. Antiochos emphasized the legal rights of his position (Polyb. 5.67.2), citing priority of ownership of Koile Syria and going back to the occupation of it by Antigonos Monophthalmos and Seleukos. He stressed especially the agreement after Ipsos, between Kassander, Lysimachos, and Seleukos, which had awarded ownership of Koile Syria to Seleukos. The Ptolemaic argument naturally claimed that the Ipsos agreement was invalid, since Seleukos had defaulted on a promise to Ptolemy I, and the latter had only been rectifying the situation by the simple expedient of occupying Koile Syria.

Despite the fact that the embassies of both sides, however sincere or insincere they may have been, were advancing "legal" arguments before the representatives of the four states, it is clear that these representatives were not admitted to have the powers of arbitrators. Polybios in fact makes a direct comment on the weakness of mediation as opposed to arbitration, and on the fact that friendly efforts at conciliation were apt to be less efficacious than a strict and neutral judgement. But if Polybios is correct in his interpretation of this whole affair, then we would hardly expect arbitration to have been accepted. The vital interests of both sides would have precluded it.

1. The trading states of the Mediterranean, in particular Rhodes, were always willing to act as mediators in the interests of a general peace. Cf. **53**, **57**.

2. Antiochos could be said to have been negotiating in good faith, but only because he expected to be able to gain his ends through diplomatic means. Rhodian good faith may also have been suspect. On the position of Rhodes, see Berthold's remarks, p. 97.

53. Several states try to mediate the Social War between Aitolia and Philip V (218–217)

I: Polybios 5.24.11–12.
II: Polybios 5.28.1–2.
III: Polybios 5.100.9–11.

Walbank, *Philip V*, pp. 24–67; Larsen, *GFS*, pp. 352–54; Huss, pp. 113f.; Will, vol. 2, pp. 75–76; Berthold, pp. 103–4; Hammond/Walbank, *Macedonia*, vol. 3, pp. 380f.; Ager, *Historia* 40 (1991) pp. 15–16.

I: Polybios 5.24.11–12

Παρόντων δὲ πρεσβευτῶν παρά τε Ῥοδίων καὶ Χίων περὶ διαλύσεως τοῦ πολέμου, χρηματίσας τούτοις καὶ συνυποκριθεὶς καὶ φήσας ἕτοιμος εἶναι διαλύεσθαι καὶ νῦν καὶ πάλαι πρὸς Αἰτωλούς, τούτους μὲν ἐξέπεμπε, διαλέγεσθαι κελεύσας καὶ τοῖς Αἰτωλοῖς περὶ τῆς διαλύσεως, (12) αὐτὸς δὲ καταβὰς εἰς τὸ Λέχαιον ἐγίνετο περὶ πλοῦν, ἔχων τινὰς πράξεις ὁλοσχερεστέρας ἐν τοῖς περὶ Φωκίδα τόποις.

II: Polybios 5.28.1–2

Οἱ δὲ παρὰ τῶν Ῥοδίων καὶ Χίων πρέσβεις ἐπανῆκον ἐκ τῆς Αἰτωλίας, ἀνοχάς τε πεποιημένοι τριακονθημέρους, καὶ πρὸς τὰς διαλύσεις ἑτοίμους φάσκοντες εἶναι τοὺς Αἰτωλούς, (2) καὶ τεταγμένοι ῥητὴν ἡμέραν, εἰς ἣν ἠξίουν τὸν Φίλιππον ἀπαντῆσαι πρὸς τὸ Ῥίον, ὑπισχνούμενοι πάντα ποιήσειν τοὺς Αἰτωλοὺς ἐφ' ᾧ συνθέσθαι τὴν εἰρήνην.

III: Polybios 5.100.9–11

Ἤδη δ' αὐτοῦ συντετελεσμένου τὰ κατὰ τὰς Θήβας, πάλιν ἦκον ὑπὲρ τῶν διαλύσεων παρά τε Χίων καὶ Ῥοδίων καὶ Βυζαντίων πρέσβεις καὶ παρὰ Πτολεμαίου τοῦ βασιλέως· (10) οἷς παραπλησίους ἀποκρίσεις δοὺς ταῖς πρότερον, καὶ φήσας οὐκ ἀλλότριος εἶναι διαλύσεως, ἔπεμψε κελεύσας αὐτοὺς πεῖραν λαμβάνειν καὶ τῶν Αἰτωλῶν. (11) αὐτὸς δὲ τῆς μὲν διαλύσεως ὠλιγώρει, τοῦ δὲ πράττειν τι τῶν ἐξῆς ἀντείχετο.

The first attempt by neutral parties to bring an end to the Social War between Philip V and Aitolia took place in the summer of 218. While Philip was at Corinth, after some successful campaigning against Sparta, he was met by an embassy from Rhodes and Chios. The Rhodian and Chian ambassadors had come in order to put an end to the war and offered their services as mediators. Economic motivations would have been uppermost in the decision of these states to attempt to effect a peace; the commercial states of the Aegean were generally

interested in maintaining an atmosphere conducive to trade.[1] Polybios tells us that Philip agreed to the proposals of the embassy and claimed that he had always been ready to make peace with the Aitolians, though in reality he saw no reason for anything other than a dictated peace for Aitolia. As for the Aitolians, they were well aware of Philip's superior military position, and therefore quite prepared to accept the good offices of Rhodes and Chios. They sent back word with the mediators that they would meet with Philip in order to discuss peace. Before such a meeting could take place, however, the Aitolians underwent a change of heart. Believing that the conspiracy of Apelles signified domestic problems for Philip, they were encouraged about their own prospects in the war. They put off the meeting with Philip, and the latter thereupon dropped any notion he might have had of negotiating. The first attempt at mediation was a failure (Polyb. 5.29).

Nevertheless, Rhodes and Chios determined to make a second effort to procure peace in Greece. In 217, shortly after Philip had taken Phthiotic Thebes, the two states sent a further embassy to try to settle the war; this time they were supported by ambassadors from Byzantion and Ptolemy IV.[2] The Egyptian ambassadors may have been mindful of the favour performed for Egypt by Aitolia in the Syrian War (**52**). Initially Philip's response appears to have been identical to that of the previous year. He sent the ambassadors on to the Aitolians, again claiming that he was always ready to make peace; but his professions, according to Polybios, were no more sincere than they had been in 218. Polybios claimed that what ultimately changed the entire status of the peace negotiations was the news of Hannibal's victory at Lake Trasimene (Polyb. 5.101).[3] Whatever Philip's western aims were at this time, the news of the Roman crisis and the influence of Demetrios of Pharos supposedly combined to make him desirous of a Greek peace in order to allow him to concentrate on affairs in Illyria.

Once Philip had decided that he wanted peace he went about it in a forthright fashion. He did not await the return of the ambassadors from the neutral states but sent his own agent to open negotiations with the Aitolians (Polyb. 5.102). Thus the second embassy also failed, in a sense, to mediate a peace. It is probable, however, that the negotiations under neutral auspices

1. Cf. **52** and **57**, and see Berthold, p. 103.

2. The appearance of ambassadors from Egypt at this point led Holleaux (*Monarchies hellénistiques*, p. 78) to conjecture that Sosibios had a new policy of cultivating the friendship of Philip as a potential weapon against Antiochos (cf. Berthold, p. 103). It is clear, however, from the reactions of the belligerents that mediation at this stage favoured Aitolia rather than Philip.

3. Nevertheless, Philip's desire for peace may have been more sincere than Polybios was willing to admit. It was, after all, the Aitolians who had withdrawn from the first round of negotiations.

already underway (however insincere they may have been in Polybios's eyes) facilitated the final negotiations for peace.

54. Officials of Philip V arbitrate between Gonnoi and Herakleion (after 218?)

Two stelai, discovered at Gonnoi in Thessaly. There are also numerous fragments from the same venue that may deal with the same case; for further epigraphic details see the notes and Helly, *Gonnoi*, vol. 2, pp. 106f.

I: h: 0.17 m; w: 0.29 m; d: 0.07 m.

Arvanitopoulos, *AE* 1913, pp. 43f., no. 173; *Helly, *Gonnoi*, vol. 2, no. 98.

II: Stele inscribed on both sides (A and B); h: 0.68 m; w: 0.53 m; d: 0.15 m.

A. S. Arvanitopoulos, *AE* 1913, pp. 25f., nos. 165a (B), 165b (A); *Helly, *Gonnoi*, vol. 2, nos. 93 A (A), 93 B (B).

P. Roussel, *REG* 27 (1914) p. 453; A. Wilhelm, *AAWW* 67 (1930) pp. 90, 102–6; T. A. Arvanitopoulou, *Polemon* 2 (1939) pp. 45–46, no. 108; p. 48, no. 114; A. McDevitt, *Inscriptions from Thessaly* (Hildesheim, 1970) 538 and 540; Robert, *REG* 1973, 244; Daverio Rocchi, pp. 102–6, no. 4 (cf. **70**).

I: Royal διάγραμμα and letter of royal representative

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - -Υ εὐορχ- - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - προχειρίσαμεν - - - - - - - -
[- - - τῶ]ι Μικίωνι τῶι γεωμ[έτρηι - - - -]
[τούτ]ων οὐκ εὐθέως συνε[λθόντων - - - - -]
5 - - -ΕΡΗΝ ἐπιτή⟨ι⟩δειον, οἱ προχ[ειρισθέντες - -]
[τὴν ἐπί]σκεψιν τῶν ἐν Βοττείαι Β- - - - - - - -
[- - ἐποί]ησαν, εἰς τὴν Πύδναν ἀνακα[λέσαι - -]
[καὶ δι]αγράψαι τοὺς τόπους ᵛ. ἔτ(ους) - - - -
ᵛ. Πετραῖος Γοννέων τοῖς ταγο[ῖς καὶ τῆι πόλει]
10 [χαίρειν· οἱ παρ]ὰ τῶν Ἡρακλειωτῶν κομίζο[ντες - -]
[- - - - - πρὸ]ς τὸν [β]ασιλέα καὶ - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - ὑμᾶς - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - -ΟΝΗΜ- - - - - - - - -

II: The arbitration of the Macedonian *epistatai*

A - - - - - - - - about 10 lines unreadable - - - - - - - -
- -ΤΟΙ- - - -ΟΠ
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -ΕΝ ἀπὸ τῶν Δ . . .

already underway (however insincere they may have been in Polybios's eyes) facilitated the final negotiations for peace.

54. Officials of Philip V arbitrate between Gonnoi and Herakleion (after 218?)

Two stelai, discovered at Gonnoi in Thessaly. There are also numerous fragments from the same venue that may deal with the same case; for further epigraphic details see the notes and Helly, *Gonnoi*, vol. 2, pp. 106f.

I: h: 0.17 m; w: 0.29 m; d: 0.07 m.

Arvanitopoulos, *AE* 1913, pp. 43f., no. 173; *Helly, *Gonnoi*, vol. 2, no. 98.

II: Stele inscribed on both sides (A and B); h: 0.68 m; w: 0.53 m; d: 0.15 m.

A. S. Arvanitopoulos, *AE* 1913, pp. 25f., nos. 165a (B), 165b (A); *Helly, *Gonnoi*, vol. 2, nos. 93 A (A), 93 B (B).

P. Roussel, *REG* 27 (1914) p. 453; A. Wilhelm, *AAWW* 67 (1930) pp. 90, 102–6; T. A. Arvanitopoulou, *Polemon* 2 (1939) pp. 45–46, no. 108; p. 48, no. 114; A. McDevitt, *Inscriptions from Thessaly* (Hildesheim, 1970) 538 and 540; Robert, *REG* 1973, 244; Daverio Rocchi, pp. 102–6, no. 4 (cf. **70**).

I: Royal διάγραμμα and letter of royal representative

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - -Υ εὐορχ- - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - προχειρίσαμεν - - - - - - - -
[- - - τῶ]ι Μικίωνι τῶι γεωμ[έτρηι - - - -]
[τούτ]ων οὐκ εὐθέως συνε[λθόντων - - - - -]
5 - - -ΕΡΗΝ ἐπιτή⟨ι⟩δειον, οἱ προχ[ειρισθέντες - -]
[τὴν ἐπί]σκεψιν τῶν ἐν Βοττείαι Β- - - - - - - -
[- - ἐποί]ησαν, εἰς τὴν Πύδναν ἀνακα[λέσαι - -]
[καὶ δι]αγράψαι τοὺς τόπους ᵛ. ἔτ(ους) - - - -
ᵛ. Πετραῖος Γοννέων τοῖς ταγο[ῖς καὶ τῆι πόλει]
10 [χαίρειν· οἱ παρ]ὰ τῶν Ἡρακλειωτῶν κομίζο[ντες - -]
[- - - - - πρὸ]ς τὸν [β]ασιλέα καὶ - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - ὑμᾶς - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - -ΟΝΗΜ- - - - - - - - -

II: The arbitration of the Macedonian *epistatai*

A - - - - - - - - about 10 lines unreadable - - - - - - - -
- -ΤΟΙ- - - -ΟΠ
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -ΕΝ ἀπὸ τῶν Δ . . .

- ΤΟΥ Δαιείου μην[ός]
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - δ[ρ]αχμὰς Ἀλεξανδρείας
ΕΙΤ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -Δ . ΣΤΟΥ πραξάντων ΕΟΝ . . .
- - - - - - - - - - -Α [π]ρο[ς]όδων τῶν τῆι πόλει [τῆι Γοννέ]-
[ω]ν ἐν τῶ[ι τ]όπωι· τοὺς δὲ ἐπιστάτας Τ . ΔΙΣΘΕΝΤΑ . Λ- - -
ΕΙΣ [ἐν] τοῖς διαγράμμαειν Μ . . Α- - - - - - - - - - - -
ΓΟΣΑΝ κα[ί], τοὺ[ς] ὅρους ἱστάναι ἐπὶ - - - - - - πο̣ι̣ο̣ῦ̣ν̣[τας]
κ[α]θάπ[ερ] ἐν τῶι διαγράμματι γέγρα[πται . . . .] Μ . ΣΑΝΤΑ- -
. . . . . Π . ΙΤ . . . . . ΤΟΥΣΑΣ οἱ ἐπιστάτ[αι - - - - - - -]
- - - - - - - - Γοννέων - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - -ΤΩΙ . . . . . ΙΙ μάλιστα ΗΣΟ . ΣΟ- - - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - -ΟΝΤΑ ἢ μήτ' ἔχοντα ΙΙΡΟΜΕ- - - - - - - - - -
[- - - - - το]ῖς ἱεροῖς ΜΗΙΔΕΕΤ . . Τ[- - - - - - - τοὺς ὅρους]
[τ]οὺς ἀφωρισμέν[ου]ς ὑπὸ [- - - - - - - τῆι τῶν Ἡρακλει]-
ω̣τῶν πόλει τὰ λοι[πὰ] Σ[- - - - - - - - - - οἱ ἀδι]-
κηκότες ἔνοχοι ἔστωσαν [τοῖς ἐπιτιμίοις - - - - - - - - -]

vacat

Β -
Γ- - - - - παρὰ Θρ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
. Λ . Γ- - - - - ταῦτ[α - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
[- - Γ]ο[ν]νέων Β- - -ΝΤ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - τ[ὰ πρ]όβατα ἐ[ν] Ε̣- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
[. . . . ο]ὔτε [νε]μόμ[ενα - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
[τὰ οἰκό]π[εδ]α ὄντ[α] ἐν Π[ο]θ[ναιεῖ - - - - - - - - - -]
- - - - - - - - - -ΝΙΧΟΥ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - -ΝΤΩΙ̣- - -ΡΑΝΤ̣Ο̣Υ̣- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
[ἐ]π̣ο̣ικούμενα καὶ γεωργ[ούμενα - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
- - - - - -ΜΟΥ ᵛ μαρτυρεῖ Μ̣έ̣[νι]ππ[ος - - - - - τῆι]
Γογ[ν]έων πόλει· "ἔβοσκον ὑπὲρ ΤΟ . . . . . 19 . . . . .
[τὰ] πρό[βα]τ̣α ἔν τε τῶι τεμένει τοῦ Ἀπόλ[λω]ν̣ο̣ς - - - -
. . . . . καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀμφιε[βη]τουμ[ένοι]ς τόποις - - - - - - -
δρα[γα]τ̣ευόμενα ὑπὸ τῶν Γοννέων, καὶ ο[ὔ]τε νεμόμ̣[ενα οὔτε δραγα]-
[τε]υ̣όμενα τὰ ἐν Λίμνηι καὶ τὰ ἐν Ποθνα[ιεῖ] οἰκόπεδα . . . . . .
[κα]ὶ οὔτε δραγατεύοντα οὔτε ν[έ]μον̣[τα] αὐ̣τ̣ῶν πρὸς τοὺς . . .
. . . ς τούτους οὐθένα· οἶδα δὲ καὶ ΠΕ . ΟΝΤΑΥΙΙΟΝ . . . . . .
. ΑΝΒΟΡΕΑΣ τὴν ἐν Ποθναιεῖ καὶ τὴν ἐν ΧΑΣ[- - - ἃς ἔδωκαν αὐτῶι οἱ]
Γοννεῖς· ὃς καὶ τέθαπται παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν τὴν ἄγουσαν ἐκ Τ- - -
. . ους εἰς Λίμναν· ἦκουον δὲ καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων [τὰ] οἰκόπε-
δα ὄντα ἐν Ποθναιεῖ ὅτι ἦσαν Γοννέων Καλλίου καὶ Φιλον[βρότου]
[οἳ καὶ] ἐ̣γεωργοῦντο καὶ ἐποικοῦντο ἕως τοῦ κατὰ Σωσθέ-
[ν]ην πολέμου." Ἱπποκράτης ὁ ἐξ Ὀλόσσονος τοῖς - - - - -
[τοὺς] ὅρους Γοννεῦσιν καὶ Ἡρακλειώταις ᵛ "τὰς μαρτυρ[ίας ἀπέδω]-
[κα] τὰς ἐ̣ς̣φραγισμένας πρὸς τῆι ἐπιστολῆι . γινώσκετε οὖ[ν] οὔ-
[τ]ως [πά]ντας τοὺς μάρτυρας καὶ μεμαρτυρηκότας κατὰ τὸ[ν]
[αὐ]τὸν νόμον." ᵛᵃᶜᵃᵗ μαρτυρεῖ Ἀλέξανδρος Δρά[κοντ]ος Μακε-

[δ]ὼν ἐξ Ἐρχείας οἰκῶν ἐν Ἀζώ[ρ]ωι τῆι πόλει τῆι Γοννέων·
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - τὰ παρὰ Κορρ[άγου] το[ῦ - - -]

vacat

The readings of Arvanitopoulos, largely unsubstantiated and differing widely from Helly's, have not been incorporated here. Cf. note 1.

Several inscriptions from Gonnoi in Perrhaebia, including fragments not reproduced here as well as the documents cited above, tell of an arbitration between Gonnoi and its Macedonian neighbour Herakleion. The details of this arbitration were recorded on the opisthographic stele (II A and B).[1] Herakleion was Macedonian, and the arbitration was carried out by Macedonians. It seems that Gonnoi at this point, while at least semi-independent, was also under the aegis of Macedon.[2] The arbitral procedure was nevertheless essentially international in character, in that it was apparently not an obligatory process imposed by the Macedonian monarch but rather came about because of the petition of the two states concerned.

Inscription II A contains a number of orders to be carried out by the *epistatai*, Macedonian officials who acted for the monarch, with the same jurisdiction in the Perrhaibian town of Gonnoi as in the Macedonian one of Herakleion.[3] These orders relate among other things to a boundary delineation, apparently the responsibility of the *epistatai*, who were to act in accordance with the ordinance (no doubt of the king): κ[α]θάπ[ερ] ἐν τῶι διαγράμματι γέγρα[πται]. A reference is also made to the revenues of Gonnoi (perhaps from the disputed land?) and to penalties to be paid, presumably by anyone contravening the agreement; perhaps the cities were intended to be liable as well as individuals.

The second text (II B), on the other hand, seems to contain a collection of material directly pertaining to the trial of the conflicting claims of the two cities. The most striking information given in this document is the direct verbal witness, in the first person, by the herder Menippos regarding his knowledge of the boundaries. The format of this is similar to the evidence of the shepherd Ladikos preserved in the inscription recording the Kondaian border arbitration

1. The fragments not reproduced here are Arvanitopoulos, *AE* 1913, pp. 38f., nos. 166, 166a, 167, 168, 170, 171, 172, 174, 175 (= *Gonnoi*, vol. 2, nos. 94, 95, 99, 96, 100, 103, 97, 101, 104); cf. McDevitt, *Thessaly* 539, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 547, 548, 549, 550, and possibly 668. These fragments appear to consist of evidence relating to the boundaries and the text of a letter, perhaps the royal letter of inscription I. Arvanitopoulos conjectured, on very little evidence, that *AE* 1911, p. 145, no. 84 (= *Gonnoi*, vol. 2, no. 105), was a decree of Gonnoi recording the (favourable) judgement in their dispute with Herakleion. Many of these fragments are only questionably related to the arbitration.

2. Helly, *Gonnoi*, vol. 1, p. 83.

3. Helly, *Gonnoi*, vol. 1, p. 83.

from the second century (**70**). Here, as there, the witness speaks from his own knowledge of the land, and from what he has heard from his elders. Apparently Menippos testified in favour of the city of Gonnoi; it is from his verbatim evidence that we get a picture of the history of the disputed land. This collection of evidence was gathered and dispatched to the hearing by one Hippokrates of Olosson, perhaps one of the *epistatai* charged with settling this affair. He mentions a letter that the evidence was to accompany; this letter may have been the official act regulating the dispute, perhaps the text preserved in inscription II A.[4]

The first and briefest in the set of inscriptions included here (I) appears to contain two separate documents, the second of which, starting at line 9, is clearly a formal letter to the city of Gonnoi from Petraios, an official of Philip V, perhaps the same Petraios who commanded Macedonian troops in Thessaly in 218. This letter mentions an embassy from Herakleion to the king, an embassy that may have been inviting royal arbitration in the dispute with Gonnoi. The first part of the inscription contains a text that handed down a number of decisions and orders. It mentions a certain Mikion, a γεωμέτρης, whose task it may have been to survey and draw up the outline of the districts. There is also a reference to the survey ([ἐπί]σκεψιν) of certain lands (?) in Botteia. Helly's reconstruction of events is that certain Macedonian functionaries had been on a tour of inspection there, perhaps one analogous to the survey to be carried out at Gonnoi and Herakleion. Helly believed that the whole document represented a royal edict, a διάγραμμα, relating to the border conflict between Gonnoi and Herakleion.[5]

The sequence of these documents may be as follows:

1. The royal διάγραμμα (I, lines 1–8), setting out certain orders regarding the boundary conflict. Perhaps this is the διάγραμμα referred to in the instructions preserved in inscription II.
2. The letter of Petraios (I, lines 9–13), informing the disputants of the royal decision to become involved as arbitrator in the conflict.
3. The instructions to the *epistatai* (II A).
4. The evidence heard by the *epistatai* (II B), collected and conveyed to the two cities involved by the official Hippokrates (II B).[6]

4. Helly, *Gonnoi*, vol. 2, p. 105.

5. Helly, *Gonnoi*, vol. 2, pp. 109–10.

6. For Helly (*Gonnoi*, vol. 1, pp. 92–93), however, all of inscription I *follows* the main part of the trial. It seems odd that the trial's final decisions would be delayed while messengers went to wherever they would have to go to get a διάγραμμα. And why, at this stage of the proceedings, would Petraios speak of a *Herakleian* embassy to the king?

This affair would have taken place sometime after 220 (see Helly's discussion).

55. The Aitolian League appoints arbitrators for Melitaia and Xyniai (214/3)

Inscription found at Delphi, on the same stele as **56**, II. The stone is apparently lost.

M. Laurent, *BCH* 25 (1901) pp. 344f., no. 2A; Kern, *IG* IX.2 *add.* no. 205 IIIA; Dittenberger/Pomtow, *SIG*^{3} 546A; H. Pomtow, *Klio* 15 (1918) pp. 9–14, no. 37; P. de la Coste-Messelière, *BCH* 49 (1925) pp. 100–101; *Klaffenbach, *IG* IX^2 1.177; Daverio Rocchi 13.2.9–17.

Raeder 42; Tod 37; H. Pomtow, *Klio* 17 (1921) p. 197; A. Wilhelm, *AAWW* 59 (1922) pp. 8–9; H. Pomtow, *Klio* 18 (1923) p. 261, no. III; G. Daux/P. de la Coste-Messelière, *BCH* 48 (1924) pp. 351–53; *SEG* II.315; Stählin, p. 161; Steinwenter, pp. 178–79; Préaux, pp. 254, 297; Larsen, *GFS*, pp. 209–10; Daverio Rocchi, pp. 143–51; Ager, *AHB* 3.5 (1989) pp. 107–14.

[Στραταγέο]γτος Πανταλέωνος τὸ πέμπτον, ἐν δὲ Μελι-
[τείαι ἀρχόντ]ων Μενεδάμου τοῦ Θρασυδάμου, Πολεμίδα
[τοῦ . . . . . ο]υ, Φείδωνος τοῦ Εὐκράτεος, ἐν δὲ Ξυνίαις Δα . .-
[. . 7 . . το]ῦ Συμμάχου, Νικία τοῦ Ἀριστίωνος, Φιλλίδα [το]ῦ
. . . 9 . . . ος ἔκρι[να]ν οἱ δικαστ[αὶ οἱ αἱρεθέν]τ[ε]ς ὑπὸ τῶν
[{τῶν}Αἰτωλ]ῶν τῶν - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
. . . . 15 . . . . ΜΚ . . . . 14 . . . . ς Πελλανε[ύς,]
. . . . 14 . . . . εος Π . . . 12 . . . ς Θεοδότου Α . -
[. . . . . ὅρια εἶμε]ν Ξυνια[ίοι]ς [κ]αὶ Μελιταιεῦσι τᾶς χώ-
[ρας, ἃς περιαγή]σαντο οἱ Μελιταιεῖς· ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱεροῦ τοῦ . -
[. . . . . κὰτ τ]ὰν νάπαν ἐν τὰν παγὰν τοῦ Χαράδ[ρ]ου κα[ὶ]
[ἐκ τᾶς παγᾶς ἐ]ν τ[ὸ ν]έμος τὸ ποτὶ τᾶι Στροβείαι· ἐ⟨κ⟩ τοῦ νέ[με]-
[ος ἐν τὰν ὁδὸ]ν τὰν [ἀ]μαξιτόν· ἐκ τᾶς ὁδοῦ ἐν τὰν ὁρίαν·
[καὶ ἀπὸ τῶ]ν ὁρίων τῶν Ῥινείων ἐν τὸ νέμος τὸ Αἰννα[ῖον·]
[ἐκ τοῦ νέμεο]ς τ[ο]ῦ Αἰνναίου ἐν τὸμ ποταμὸν τὸν Χάρ[α]-
[δρον· ἐκ τοῦ Χ]αράδρου ἐν τὸ Χῶμα· ἐκ τοῦ Χώματος ἐν
[τὰμ παγὰν? Σ]κυ[ρ]αν[ί]δα καλουμέναν· μάρτυρες Λυκίς-
[κος . . . . .], Λυκίσκος Σκορπίωνος, Ἀνδρόνικος Βίττου, Δα-
. . . 9 . . . νίκου, Δίκων Πολυχάρμου, Δικαίαρχος Κρινο-
[λάου, ...] Λαμίου, Νικόμαχος Μάχωνος Θέρμιοι· Εὐ-
. . . . ., ... ίων, Ξενίας, Λ[υ]κίσκος Εἰδαῖοι· Λόχαγος Ν .-
[- - - Μελ]ιταιέοις κα[ὶ] Πηρέοις ἔκ[ριν]αν κτλ. (see **56**, II)

2: Πολειμίδα [τοῦ]: Laurent, Kern, de la Coste-Messelière. Πολεμίτα: Pomtow, *SIG*^{3}, *Klio* 15. || 3–4: Δα[μο]στράτου?]: Pomtow, *SIG*^{3}, *Klio* 15. || 4: Ἀρίστωνος: Laurent, Kern. || 5: [οὕτ]ως ἔκρι[να]ν: de la Coste-Messelière. || 5–6: ὑπὸ τῶν| [Αἰτωλῶν . . . .]ΝΤΟ: Laurent, Kern, de la Coste-Messelière. ὑπὸ τῶν| [Αἰτωλ]ῶν, τῶν π[όλεων ἐξ ὁμολόγων ἐπιχωρης]άντ[ων]: Pomtow, *SIG*^{3}, *Klio* 15. || 7: . . . . α Γ . . . . α[ς], Κ[αλλείδης? . . . ωνο]ς Πελλανε[ύς]: Pomtow, *SIG*^{3}, *Klio* 15. Πελλανε[ῖς]: de la Coste-Messelière. [ὁ δεῖνα] Ἀγ[γειάτ]α[ς]: Wilhelm,

AAWW 59; cf. Pomtow, *Klio* 18 (1923) p. 317. -άγ[ρου Χ]α[λ]κ[ιδεύς?]: Crönert, *SEG* II.315. || 8–9: -εος Π[ελλανεύς?, Φιλώτ]ας Θεοδότου Ἀ[πε|ραντός.]: Pomtow, *SIG*^{3}, *Klio* 15. || 9: [εἶμεν] Μελιται[έων] τὰς χ[ώρας]: Laurent, Kern. [ὅρια εἶμε]ν Ξυνια[ίοι]ς καὶ Μελιταιεῦσι τᾶς χώ[ρας]: Pomtow, *SIG*^{3}, *Klio* 15. || 10: [ἃς ἡμᾶς περιηγής]αντο οἱ Μελιταιεῖς: Laurent. [ἃς ἀμὲ]: Kern, de la Coste-Messelière. [ἂν ἀμὲ]: Pomtow, *SIG*^{3}, *Klio* 15. ἀπὸ τοῦ Προίτο[υ]: Kern. || 10–11: ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱεροῦ τοῦ| [Βορρᾶ]: Pomtow, *SIG*^{3}, *Klio* 15. ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱεροῦ τοῦ [Ἀ|πόλλωνος]: de la Coste-Messelière (with reservations). || 11: [γω]νίαν ἐν τὰμ παγὰν: Kern. || 12: τὸ ποτὶ τᾷ Ἰσιδι: Kern. τὸ ποτὶ τᾶι Στροβείαι: Pomtow, *SIG*^{3}, *Klio* 15. ἀ[πὸ] τοῦ NI . . . : Laurent. ἀ[πὸ] τοῦ ν[έμεος]: Kern. ἀπ⟨ὸ?⟩ τοῦ νέ[μεος]: Pomtow, *SIG*^{3}. ἄν⟨ω?⟩ τοῦ νέ[με|ος]: Pomtow, *Klio* 15. At the end of the line the stone reads EN. || 13: OPIAN: de la Coste-Messelière. || 13–14: ἐν τὰ⟨ν⟩ ὄρη [τὰ| Ἰόνεια· ἐξ ὁ]ρέων τῶν Ἰονείων ἐν τὸ νέμος τὸ Αἰννᾳ[ῖον]: Pomtow, *SIG*^{3}, *Klio* 15. τὸ νέμος τὸ ἄ[γον]: Laurent, Kern. || 17: [τὰν παγὰν] Ξυταρίδα: Pomtow, *SIG*^{3}, *Klio* 15. || 17–18: Λυκίς|[κος Λύκου]: Pomtow, *SIG*^{3}, *Klio* 15. || 18–19: Δά|[μων? Ἑλλα]νίκου: Pomtow, *SIG*^{3}, *Klio* 15. Δί|[κων?]: de la Coste-Messelière. || 20–21: Εὐ[ρύ|δαμος?, Δά?]μων: Pomtow, *SIG*^{3}, *Klio* 15. || 21: -ιων, Εἰ[ρ]ηνίας: de la Coste-Messelière. || 21–22: Λοχαγὸς Κ[αλλι|πολίτας]: Pomtow, *SIG*^{3}, *Klio* 15.

This document, like the one in **56**, is evidence for another boundary dispute involving the town of Melitaia in Achaia Phthiotis; this time, the quarrel was with Melitaia's western neighbour Xyniai. At the time of this arbitration Achaia Phthiotis was under the control of the Aitolian League, and the League was involved in the settlement of this dispute. In cases of arbitration by the Achaian League we have seen the League delegating the task to one or more member cities, who would then choose the judges required.[1] In this example of arbitration by the Aitolian League, if we can trust the restoration, the judges were chosen directly by a League body, perhaps the council.[2] The arbitrators carried out a complete tour of the boundaries, although the fact that they were apparently guided only by Melitaian envoys casts doubt on the objectivity of their final decision.[3] The disputed territory is not said to have become the property of either Melitaia or Xyniai, but Melitaia did have a history of winning these border disputes with its neighbours. Throughout the third century and earlier Melitaia had generally benefitted territorially in various arbitrations and, it seems, had made it an active practice to exploit the judicial system wherever possible.[4]

The two documents for this case and **56** were published together at Delphi.[5] It has been shown, however, that these two arbitrations took place as much as a

1. See **38**, **46**.

2. Larsen, *GFS*, pp. 209–10. Cf. the ambassadors and judges in **40**.

3. In **30** and **31** as well, representatives of one of the parties to the dispute may have been absent from the border examination of the judges.

4. See **30**, **31**, **32**, **56**, and Ager, *AHB* 3.5.

5. Cf. **30** and **31**, both published on the same stone, also at Delphi.

year apart.[6] It may be that international publication of such decrees was briefly delayed and then implemented in batches, whereas publication in the cities involved would be carried out immediately. That this may have been regular procedure is illustrated by the fact that the stone found at Melitaia bearing the inscription discussed in **56** apparently bore only the one inscription.

56. The Aitolian League appoints arbitrators to carry out a sympolity between Melitaia and Pereia (213/2)

Two inscriptions, one a lengthy document found in 1905 at Melitaia (I), the other a much briefer and fragmented version of the same decision (II), recorded at Delphi along with the document discussed in **55**.

I: h: 0.85 m; w: 0.555 m; d: 0.47 m.

A. Rangabé, *Antiquités helléniques* (Athens, 1842) 692; J. L. Ussing, *Inscriptiones Graecae Ineditae* (Copenhagen 1847) 2; LeBas/Foucart 1179; Cauer^2 239; A. Fick, *Bezzenberger's Beiträge* 6, p. 312; id., *SGDI* 1415; W. Feldmann, *Analecta Epigraphica* (Strasbourg, 1885) pp. 104–128; Berard 25; Michel 22; Giannopoulos/Spyriadakis, *AD* 3 (1900) p. 24 II; Dittenberger, *SIG*^{2} 425; Kern, *IG* IX.2.205; F. Bleckmann, *Griechische Inschriften zur griechischen Staatenkunde* (Bonn, 1913) 5; Dittenberger/Pomtow, *SIG*^{3} 546B; Schwyzer 388; *Klaffenbach, *IG* IX^{2}1.188; E. Karamanoles, Θεσσαλικο Ἡμερολογιο 9 (1986) pp. 27–30.

II: No epigraphic details available, as the stone is lost.

M. Laurent, *BCH* 25 (1901) pp. 345f., no. 2B; *Kern, *IG* IX.2 *add.* no. 205 IIIB; Dittenberger/Pomtow, *SIG*^{3} 546B; H. Pomtow, *Klio* 15 (1918) pp. 9–14, no. 37; Daverio Rocchi 13.2 (lines 3–12, 16–17).

E. Kuhn, *Über die Entstehung der Städte der Alten* (Leipzig, 1878) pp. 124–25; M. Dubois, *Les ligues étoliennes et achéennes* (Paris, 1885) p. 225; E. Szanto, *Das griechische Bürgerrecht* (Freiburg, 1892) pp. 151–54; A. Wilhelm, *AEM* 15 (1892) p. 120; H. Pomtow, *JKPh* 149 (1894) p. 833; id., *JKPh* 155 (1897) pp. 788–99; A. Wilhelm, *GGA* 1898, p. 206; Hitzig 19; Phillipson, p. 143; Raeder 41; Tod 35 (I), 36 (II); C. D. Buck, *CPh* 8 (1913) p. 151; F. Stählin, *MDAI(A)* 39 (1914) pp. 83–103; H. Pomtow, *Klio* 17 (1921) p. 197; id., *Klio* 18 (1923) p. 261 no. IV; Stählin, pp. 159–69; P. de la Coste-Messelière, *BCH* 49 (1925) pp. 100f.; Steinwenter, pp. 178–79, 193; G. Klaffenbach, *IG* IX^2 1, p. xxix; Préaux, pp. 250, 251, 297; Larsen, *GFS*, pp. 198–99, 209–10; L. Migeotte, *L'emprunt public dans les cités grecques* (Quebec

6. An exact date for this inscription (213/2) comes from the explicit dating to the fifth Aitolian *strategia* of Pantaleon.

year apart.[6] It may be that international publication of such decrees was briefly delayed and then implemented in batches, whereas publication in the cities involved would be carried out immediately. That this may have been regular procedure is illustrated by the fact that the stone found at Melitaia bearing the inscription discussed in **56** apparently bore only the one inscription.

56. The Aitolian League appoints arbitrators to carry out a sympolity between Melitaia and Pereia (213/2)

Two inscriptions, one a lengthy document found in 1905 at Melitaia (I), the other a much briefer and fragmented version of the same decision (II), recorded at Delphi along with the document discussed in **55**.

I: h: 0.85 m; w: 0.555 m; d: 0.47 m.

A. Rangabé, *Antiquités helléniques* (Athens, 1842) 692; J. L. Ussing, *Inscriptiones Graecae Ineditae* (Copenhagen 1847) 2; LeBas/Foucart 1179; Cauer^2 239; A. Fick, *Bezzenberger's Beiträge* 6, p. 312; id., *SGDI* 1415; W. Feldmann, *Analecta Epigraphica* (Strasbourg, 1885) pp. 104–128; Berard 25; Michel 22; Giannopoulos/Spyriadakis, *AD* 3 (1900) p. 24 II; Dittenberger, *SIG*^{2} 425; Kern, *IG* IX.2.205; F. Bleckmann, *Griechische Inschriften zur griechischen Staatenkunde* (Bonn, 1913) 5; Dittenberger/Pomtow, *SIG*^{3} 546B; Schwyzer 388; *Klaffenbach, *IG* IX^{2}1.188; E. Karamanoles, Θεσσαλικο Ἡμερολογιο 9 (1986) pp. 27–30.

II: No epigraphic details available, as the stone is lost.

M. Laurent, *BCH* 25 (1901) pp. 345f., no. 2B; *Kern, *IG* IX.2 *add.* no. 205 IIIB; Dittenberger/Pomtow, *SIG*^{3} 546B; H. Pomtow, *Klio* 15 (1918) pp. 9–14, no. 37; Daverio Rocchi 13.2 (lines 3–12, 16–17).

E. Kuhn, *Über die Entstehung der Städte der Alten* (Leipzig, 1878) pp. 124–25; M. Dubois, *Les ligues étoliennes et achéennes* (Paris, 1885) p. 225; E. Szanto, *Das griechische Bürgerrecht* (Freiburg, 1892) pp. 151–54; A. Wilhelm, *AEM* 15 (1892) p. 120; H. Pomtow, *JKPh* 149 (1894) p. 833; id., *JKPh* 155 (1897) pp. 788–99; A. Wilhelm, *GGA* 1898, p. 206; Hitzig 19; Phillipson, p. 143; Raeder 41; Tod 35 (I), 36 (II); C. D. Buck, *CPh* 8 (1913) p. 151; F. Stählin, *MDAI(A)* 39 (1914) pp. 83–103; H. Pomtow, *Klio* 17 (1921) p. 197; id., *Klio* 18 (1923) p. 261 no. IV; Stählin, pp. 159–69; P. de la Coste-Messelière, *BCH* 49 (1925) pp. 100f.; Steinwenter, pp. 178–79, 193; G. Klaffenbach, *IG* IX^2 1, p. xxix; Préaux, pp. 250, 251, 297; Larsen, *GFS*, pp. 198–99, 209–10; L. Migeotte, *L'emprunt public dans les cités grecques* (Quebec

6. An exact date for this inscription (213/2) comes from the explicit dating to the fifth Aitolian *strategia* of Pantaleon.

and Paris, 1984) 31 (with an edition of lines 16–23); Daverio Rocchi, pp. 143–51; Ager, *AHB* 3.5 (1989) pp. 107–14.

I: The Melitaia copy

Μελιταιέοις καὶ Πηρέοις ἔκριναν οἱ ὑπὸ τῶν Αἰτωλῶν αἱρεθέν-
τες δικασταὶ Δωρίμαχος, Πολεμαῖος, Ἀργεῖος Καλυδώνιοι αὐτῶν
ἐπιχωρησάντων ἐξ ὁμολόγων· ὅρια μὲν εἶμεν τᾶς χώρας Μελιταιέ-
οις καὶ Πηρέοις, ὡς ὁ Ἀχμεὺς ἐμβάλλει ἐν τὸν Εὐρωπόν, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ
Ἀχμέος ἐν τὰν παγὰν τοῦ Γαλαίου, καὶ ἀπὸ Γαλαίου ἐν τὰν Κολώ-
ναν, καὶ ἀπὸ τᾶς Κολώνας ἐπὶ τὸ Ἑρμαῖον ἐπὶ τὰ Εὐρύνια, καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν Ε[ὐ]-
ρυνίων κατὰ τῶν ἄκρων, ὡς ὕδωρ ῥεῖ ἐν τὸν Εὐρωπόν, ἐκ τοῦ Εὐρω-
ποῦ ἐν τὸν Ἐλιπῆ, ἐκ τοῦ Ἐλιπέος ἐν τὸ νέμος τὸ ἄγον ἐν τὰν Ἄ[μπε]-
λον, ἀπὸ τᾶς Ἀμπέλου κατὰ τῶν ἄκρων ἐπὶ τὸ Ὕπατον, ἀπὸ
ν τοῦ Ὑπάτου ἐν τὸν Κερκινῆ, ἀπὸ τοῦ Κερκινέος ἐν
ν τὰν Μύνιν, ἀπὸ τᾶς Μύνιος ἐν τὸν Εὐρωπόν, τοῦ Σκαπεταίου
καὶ τοῦ Εὐρωποῦ ἐν τὰν συμβολάν. τὰν δὲ δαμοσίαν χώ-
ραν, τούς τε Καράνδας καὶ τὰν Φυλιαδόνα, μὴ ἀποδόσθων Με-
λιταεῖς ὥστε πατρώιαν ἔχειν τὸν πριάμενον πολιτευόντω[ν]
Πηρέων μετὰ Μελιταιέων, ἀλλὰ κατ' ἄνπαλον μισθούντω κα-
θὼς καὶ τὸ πρότερον. εἰ δέ κα ἀποπολιτεύωντι Πηρεῖς ἀπὸ Μελ[ι]-
ταέων, περὶ μὲν τᾶς χώρας ὅροις χρήσθων τοῖς γεγραμμένοις καὶ ἔ-
χοντες ἀποπορευέσθων βουλευτὰν ἕνα καὶ τὰ δάνεια συναπο-
τινόντω, ὅσα κα ἁ πόλις ὀφείλῃ, κατὰ τὸ ἐπιβάλλον μέρος
τοῦ βουλευτᾶ καὶ ἐμφερόντω τὰ ἐ[ν] τοὺς Αἰτωλοὺς γινόμε-
να κατὰ τὸν βουλευτάν. ἀποδόντων δὲ οἱ Πηρεῖς τὰς δεκάτας
τὰς γινομένας τοῖς δανειστaῖς, ἃς ὀφείλοντι ἐτέων τριῶν, ἀ-
ναβολὰν λαβόντες ἔτη τρία. ὅσα δὲ καὶ πρότερον ἐλάμβανον ο[ἱ]
Πηρεῖς πὰρ τᾶς πόλιος κατ' ἐνιαυτόν, τοῖς τε ἀρχόντοις ἀργυρίου
μνᾶς τρεῖς καὶ κάρυκι στατῆρας δέκα καὶ εἰς τὸ ἔλαιον τοῖς νεανί-
οις (sic) στατῆρας δέκα καὶ εἰς τὰν θυσίαν τῶν Σωτηρίων στατῆρας πέντε,
καὶ νῦν λανβανόντω, καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἐπιμελέσθω ἁ πόλις τῶν Μελιτα-
έων τῶν κοινῶν ἐμ Πηρέοις καθὼς καὶ τὸ πρότερον. νόμοις δὲ χρῆς-
θων Πηρεῖς τοῖς αὐτοῖς καὶ Μελιταεῖς. τὰς δὲ ἐν ἀγορανόμοις δίκας γινομέ-
νας Πηρέοις ποτὶ Πηρεῖς κατὰ τετράμηνον δικαζόντω ἐμ Πηρέοις οἱ ἐγ Με-
λιτείας ἀγορανόμοι. ἀναγραφήτω δὲ ταῦτα ἐν στάλας ἔν τε Μελιτείαι
καὶ ἐν Δελφοῖς καὶ ἐν Καλυδῶνι καὶ ἐν Θέρμωι. μάρτυρες· τὸ συνέδριον ἅ-
παν τὸ ἐπὶ γραμματέος Λύκου καὶ οἱ προσστάται τοῦ συνεδρίου [Πει]-
θόλαος Σπάττιος, Δύσωπος Ἀπολλωνιεὺς καὶ ὁ γραμματεὺς [Λύ]-
κος Ἐρυθραῖος καὶ ὁ ἱππάρχας Ἀλέξων Ἑρμάττιος, Πανταλέω[ν Πε]-
τάλου Πλευρώνιος, Νικόστρατος Νικοστράτου Ναυπάκτιος,
Δαμόξενος Θεοδώρου Ἡρακλεώτας.

1: Μελιταίοις: Rangabé. || 4, 7, 11: Εὔρωπον: Rangabé, Cauer, Berard, Feldmann. || 17–18: [καὶ λα]|χόντες: Cauer, Berard. || 20: τὰ ἐς τοὺς: Rangabé. || 23–24: ἐλάμβανον| Πηρεῖς: Rangabé. || 25–26: νεανί|αις: Rangabé, Cauer, Berard. νεανί|[α]ις: Fick, *SGDI*; Feldmann; Michel; Dittenberger, *SIG*^{2}. νεανί|οις: Kern;

Pomtow, *SIG*^{3}; Schwyzer. || 27–28: Μελιτε[αί]|ων: Rangabé. || 28: κοινῶν τῶν ἐμ Πηρεοῖc: Rangabé, Feldmann. τῶν κοινῶν τῶν ἐμ Πηρέοις: Schwyzer. || 32–33: τὸ cυνέδριον Α[ἰτω|λ]ῶν: Rangabé; Cauer; Berard; Fick, *SGDI*; Feldmann; Michel. τὸ cυνέδριον ἅ|παν: Dittenberger, *SIG*^{3}; Kern; Pomtow, *SIG*^{3}; Schwyzer. || 33–34: . . .|μαος: Rangabé. [Ἑρμ|ό]λαος: Cauer, Berard. [Οἰνό]|μαος: Fick, *SGDI*; Feldmann; Michel. [Ὀρ]|θόλαος: Dittenberger, *SIG*^{2}. [Ὀρ-? Πει-?]|θόλαος: Kern. [Πει]|θόλαος: Pomtow, *SIG*^{3}; Schwyzer. || 34–35: ὁ γραμματεὺ[c Ἔπο]|χος: Cauer; Berard; Fick, *SGDI*; Feldmann; Michel. [Λύ]|κος: Dittenberger, *SIG*^{2}; Kern; Pomtow, *SIG*^{3}; Schwyzer. || 35–36: Παντα|λέ[ων Ἀτ]|τάλου: Rangabé; Cauer; Berard; Fick, *SGDI*; Feldmann; Michel. [Πε]|τάλου: Dittenberger, *SIG*^{2}; Kern; Pomtow, *SIG*^{3}; Schwyzer.

II: The Delphi copy

[Μελιταιέοι]c κα[ὶ] Πηρ[έοις ἔκριναν] οἱ ὑπὸ τῶν [Αἰτωλῶν]
[αἱρεθέντες δι]κασταὶ Δωρίμαχος, [Πο]λεμαῖος, [Ἀργεῖ]ος [Κα]-
[λυδώνιοι, αὐτῶν cυγ]χωρηcάντων ἐξ ὁμολόγων· ὅρια μὲν
[εἶμεν τᾶς χώρας Μ]ελιταιέοις [καὶ Πηρέοις] ὡ[c ὁ Ἀχμεὺc ἐμβάλλει]
[ἐν τὸν Εὐρωπόν, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀχμ]έος [ἐν τὰν παγὰν τοῦ]
[Γαλαίου, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ Γαλαίου ἐν τὰν Κ]ολ[ώναν καὶ ἀπὸ τᾶc]
[Κολώνας ἐπὶ τὸ Ἑρμ]αῖον ἐ[πὶ τὰ Εὐρύνια κτλ.]

3: [ἐπι]χ[ωρηcάντω]ν: Laurent, Pomtow.

This document, of which one complete copy and part of another have survived, contains a sympolity agreement between the two small states of Melitaia and Pereia. The fragmented second copy (II) was discovered at Delphi; from lines 31–32 of the first we learn that copies of the inscription were to be published at Melitaia, Delphi, Kalydon (the home state of the arbitrators), and Thermon, the Aitolian sanctuary. The Delphic copy was inscribed on the same stone as the arbitral judgement of the Aitolians between Melitaia and another of its neighbours, Xyniai (**55**). The present sympolity agreement also entailed an arbitral judgement that settled certain disputes between the two parties to the union. Three judges, citizens of Kalydon, were chosen to arbitrate by the Aitolians, with the agreement of the two litigant states. The wording of the inscription suggests that the individuals chosen were not delegated by their home state but rather by an official decision of the Aitolian League. It is not certain whether this arbitration-sympolity arrangement was the result of a binding agreement placed on members of the Aitolian League to submit their disputes to arbitration, or of a voluntary action on the part of the two states involved.[1] It has been suggested elsewhere that Melitaia, at any rate,

1. For the date of this arbitration see **55**. Dittenberger (*SIG*^{2}) maintains that the two states turned to Aitolia voluntarily; see also Steinwenter, pp. 178–79; and Larsen, *GFS*, p. 210. Raeder (pp. 222–23) interprets the words αὐτῶν ἐπιχωρηcάντων ἐξ ὁμολόγων as referring to the

was often eager to go to arbitration for its own purposes, a consideration that makes it unlikely that the League was interested in forcing this union on Melitaia and Pereia.[2]

The duties of the judges included preparing a detailed boundary demarcation. Although the two states were joined in a sympolity and made joint use of at least part of their land, a boundary demarcation was necessary because the option of leaving the sympolity was open to Pereia. This concession to the Pereians underlines the superior status of Melitaia in this arrangement. The delimitation was carried out to act as a safeguard against future disputes, and the boundaries set by the Kalydonian judges were meant to be permanent. The judges were also to rule on the use of certain territories, "Phyliadon" and "Karandai," which were to be held in common. The Aitolian judges ruled against apparent Melitaian proposals that lots of the common land be sold; it may be that this had been Pereian land before the sympolity took place, and Pereian objection to Melitaian plans to sell it was based on the certainty that it would be lost to them if the sympolity broke up.[3] So much seems certain. What is less sure is the implication of the judges' decision for the possible dissolution of the union. Some scholars believed that in this matter Pereia had its way: in the case of a split, the joint land would go to Pereia.[4] Stählin, however, held that it was unlikely that Melitaia would lose so completely on its claim. He believed that the ruling on the common land meant that Pereia won its case insofar as it would have the use of the land as long as the sympolity lasted; but if Pereia left the sympolity, it would retain only that land that was within the prescribed borders. Melitaia would then be free to do what it wanted with the rest of the land. The Kalydonians also set out regulations for the sympolity in constitutional, financial, and legal matters, including again the contingency of dissolution of the union. The judgement was witnessed by the whole council of the Aitolian League, which acted as witness and guarantor of the treaty.

Melitaia was clearly the senior partner here. The two states may already have been in some form of sympolity; perhaps dissensions arose after the union, at which stage they would have turned to the League.[5] But, for once, Melitaia did not have it all its own way. The Aitolian judges apparently took

---

individual treaty signed with the Aitolian League when a city became a member, requiring that disputes be submitted to the authority of the League. This is conjecture; the evidence for such a practice is better in the case of the Achaian League.

2. See **55**, and Ager, *AHB* 3.5.

3. See *SIG*^{2}. Stählin (p. 168) believed that "Phyliadon" was a community dependent on Pereia, which the latter brought with it into the sympolity. Cf. **31**, where Pereia acted for what was probably the same community, although there the place was called Phylladon.

4. See Feldmann, p. 212; *SIG*^{2} n. 10; Tod, pp. 62f.

5. *SIG*^{2}. See Rangabé, p. 284; Steinwenter, pp. 178–79.

their jobs as arbitrators seriously and validated at least some of the claims of the smaller city. The fact that the judges recognized the possibility of Pereia dissolving the sympolity and granted Pereia's potential independent representation in the council of the Aitolian League shows that Pereia had some claim to the status of an independent community. Perhaps implicit in this judgement is that Melitaia wanted to refuse Pereia the right to leave the union as an independent state; the Kalydonian arbitration, however, guaranteed this right. The Aitolian judges were clearly not interested in forcing a radical and unwelcome sympolity on partners of whom one at least might be unwilling; rather, they seem to have responded to a request initiated by the communities involved, and arbitrated concerns that these communities were unable to resolve themselves.

57. Several states try to mediate the First Macedonian War (209–205)

I: Livy 27.30.3–4.
II: Livy 28.7.13–14.
III: Appian *Macedonica* 3.1.
IV: Polybios 11.4–6.
V: Cassius Dio 17.58–59. Cf. Zonaras 9.11.7.
VI: An inscription discovered at Delos (stylistically dated to the end of the third century or beginning of the second) may have some bearing on this case, although its connection is conjectural. H: 0.21 m; w: 0.16 m; d: 0.03 m. *Roussel, *IG* XI.1066; Schmitt 550.

Holleaux, *Monarchies hellénistiques*, pp. 35 n. 6, 253 n. 1; C. G. Starr, *CPh* 33 (1938) pp. 63–68; Walbank, *Philip V*, pp. 89f.; S. I. Oost, *CPh* 52 (1957) pp. 1–15; H. Schmitt, *Rom und Rhodos* (Munich, 1957) pp. 193–211; Larsen, *GFS*, pp. 371–73; Schmitt 543; Klose, pp. 98–99, 113–14 n. 434; Huss, pp. 110f., 165f.; Will, vol. 2, pp. 91–93; J. W. Rich, *PCPhS* n.s. 30 (1984) pp. 143f.; Berthold, pp. 104–7; Gruen, p. 117; Hammond/Walbank, *Macedonia*, vol. 3, pp. 403f.; Eckstein, *Historia* 37 (1988) pp. 418–20; Ager, *Historia* 40 (1991) pp. 16–17.

I: Livy 27.30.3–4

> Inde cum Aetoli metu compulsi Lamiae urbis moenibus tenerent sese, Philippus ad Phalara exercitum reduxit. . . . eo legati ab rege Aegypti Ptolomaeo Rhodiisque et Atheniensibus et Chiis venerunt ad dirimendum inter Philippum atque Aetolos bellum. Adhibitus ab Aetolis et ex finitimis pacificator Amynander rex Athamanum.

their jobs as arbitrators seriously and validated at least some of the claims of the smaller city. The fact that the judges recognized the possibility of Pereia dissolving the sympolity and granted Pereia's potential independent representation in the council of the Aitolian League shows that Pereia had some claim to the status of an independent community. Perhaps implicit in this judgement is that Melitaia wanted to refuse Pereia the right to leave the union as an independent state; the Kalydonian arbitration, however, guaranteed this right. The Aitolian judges were clearly not interested in forcing a radical and unwelcome sympolity on partners of whom one at least might be unwilling; rather, they seem to have responded to a request initiated by the communities involved, and arbitrated concerns that these communities were unable to resolve themselves.

57. Several states try to mediate the First Macedonian War (209–205)

I: Livy 27.30.3–4.
II: Livy 28.7.13–14.
III: Appian *Macedonica* 3.1.
IV: Polybios 11.4–6.
V: Cassius Dio 17.58–59. Cf. Zonaras 9.11.7.
VI: An inscription discovered at Delos (stylistically dated to the end of the third century or beginning of the second) may have some bearing on this case, although its connection is conjectural. H: 0.21 m; w: 0.16 m; d: 0.03 m. *Roussel, *IG* XI.1066; Schmitt 550.

Holleaux, *Monarchies hellénistiques*, pp. 35 n. 6, 253 n. 1; C. G. Starr, *CPh* 33 (1938) pp. 63–68; Walbank, *Philip V*, pp. 89f.; S. I. Oost, *CPh* 52 (1957) pp. 1–15; H. Schmitt, *Rom und Rhodos* (Munich, 1957) pp. 193–211; Larsen, *GFS*, pp. 371–73; Schmitt 543; Klose, pp. 98–99, 113–14 n. 434; Huss, pp. 110f., 165f.; Will, vol. 2, pp. 91–93; J. W. Rich, *PCPhS* n.s. 30 (1984) pp. 143f.; Berthold, pp. 104–7; Gruen, p. 117; Hammond/Walbank, *Macedonia*, vol. 3, pp. 403f.; Eckstein, *Historia* 37 (1988) pp. 418–20; Ager, *Historia* 40 (1991) pp. 16–17.

I: Livy 27.30.3–4

> Inde cum Aetoli metu compulsi Lamiae urbis moenibus tenerent sese, Philippus ad Phalara exercitum reduxit. . . . eo legati ab rege Aegypti Ptolomaeo Rhodiisque et Atheniensibus et Chiis venerunt ad dirimendum inter Philippum atque Aetolos bellum. Adhibitus ab Aetolis et ex finitimis pacificator Amynander rex Athamanum.

II: Livy 28.7.13–14

Inde Elatiam, iussis ibi se opperiri Ptolomaei Rhodiorumque legatis, venit. ubi cum de finiendo Aetolico bello ageretur—adfuerant enim legati nuper Heracleae concilio Romanorum Aetolorumque—, nuntius adfertur Machanidam Olympiorum sollemne ludicrum parantes Eleos adgredi statuisse.

III: Appian *Macedonica* 3.1

Ὅτι Πτολεμαίου τοῦ βασιλεύοντος Αἰγύπτου πρέσβεις, καὶ σὺν αὐτοῖς ἕτεροι παρά τε Χίων καὶ Μιτυληναίων καὶ Ἀμυνάνδρου τοῦ Ἀθαμάνων βασιλέως, δίς, ἔνθα περ οἱ Αἰτωλοὶ τὰς πόλεις ἐπισκεψομένας ἐκάλουν, συνῆλθον ἐπὶ διαλλαγῇ Ῥωμαίων καὶ Αἰτωλῶν καὶ Φιλίππου. Σουλπικίου δ' εἰπόντος οὐκ εἶναι κυρίου περὶ τῆς εἰρήνης τι κρῖναι, καὶ ἐς τὴν βουλὴν κρύφα ἐπιστέλλοντος ὅτι Ῥωμαίοις συμφέρει πολεμεῖν Αἰτωλοὺς Φιλίππῳ, ἡ μὲν βουλὴ τὰς συνθήκας ἐκώλυσε, καὶ τοῖς Αἰτωλοῖς ἔπεμπε συμμαχίαν πεζοὺς μυρίους καὶ ἱππέας χιλίους, μεθ' ὧν οἱ Αἰτωλοὶ κατέλαβον Ἀμβρακίαν, ἣν οὐ πολὺ ὕστερον αὐτῶν Φίλιππος ἀποπλευσάντων ἀνέλαβεν. οἱ δὲ πρέσβεις αὖθις συνῆλθον, καὶ πολλὰ φανερῶς ἔλεγον, ὅτι Φίλιππος καὶ Αἰτωλοὶ διαφερόμενοι τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἐς δουλείαν Ῥωμαίοις ὑποβάλλουσιν, ἐθίζοντες αὐτοὺς τῆς Ἑλλάδος θαμινὰ πειρᾶσθαι. ἐφ' οἷς ὁ μὲν Σουλπίκιος ἀντιλέξων ἀνίστατο, τὸ δὲ πλῆθος οὐκ ἤκουεν, ἀλλ' ἐκεκράγεσαν τοὺς πρέσβεις εὖ λέγειν.

IV: Polybios 11.4–6

"Ὅτι μὲν οὔτε Πτολεμαῖος ὁ βασιλεὺς οὔθ' ἡ τῶν Ῥοδίων πόλις οὔθ' ἡ τῶν Βυζαντίων καὶ Χίων καὶ Μυτιληναίων ἐν παρέργῳ τίθενται τὰς ὑμετέρας, ὦ ἄνδρες Αἰτωλοί, διαλύσεις, ἐξ αὐτῶν τῶν πραγμάτων ὑπολαμβάνω τοῦτ' εἶναι συμφανές. (2) οὐ γὰρ νῦν πρῶτον οὐδὲ δεύτερον ποιούμεθα πρὸς ὑμᾶς τοὺς ὑπὲρ τῆς εἰρήνης λόγους, ἀλλ' ἐξ ὅτου τὸν πόλεμον ἐνεστήσασθε, προσεδρεύοντες καὶ πάντα καιρὸν θεραπεύοντες οὐ διαλείπομεν ὑπὲρ τούτων ποιούμενοι πρὸς ὑμᾶς μνήμην, (3) κατὰ μὲν τὸ παρὸν τῆς ὑμετέρας καὶ Μακεδόνων στοχαζόμενοι καταφθορᾶς, πρὸς δὲ τὸ μέλλον καὶ περὶ τῶν σφετέρων πατρίδων καὶ περὶ τῶν ἄλλων Ἑλλήνων προνοούμενοι.... (6) διόπερ, ὦ ἄνδρες Αἰτωλοί, νομίσαντες καὶ τοὺς νησιώτας πανδημεὶ καὶ τοὺς τὴν Ἀσίαν κατοικοῦντας Ἕλληνας παρόντας ὑμῶν δεῖσθαι τὸν μὲν πόλεμον ἆραι, τὴν δ' εἰρήνην ἑλέσθαι, διὰ τὸ καὶ πρὸς σφᾶς ἀνήκειν τὰ γινόμενα, σωφρονήσαντες ἐντράπητε καὶ πείσθητε τοῖς παρακαλουμένοις.... [5].... (7) συνθήκας δὲ πεποίησθε τοιαύτας, δί ὧν ἅπαντας τοὺς ἄλλους Ἕλληνας ἐκδότους δεδώκατε τοῖς βαρβάροις εἰς τὰς αἰσχίστας ὕβρεις καὶ παρανομίας.... [6] ὅτι γάρ, ἂν Ῥωμαῖοι τὸν ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ πόλεμον ἀποτρίψωνται—τοῦτο δ' ἐστὶν ἐν ὀλίγῳ, συγκεκλειμένου τῆς Βρεττίας εἰς πάνυ βραχεῖς τόπους Ἀννίβου—(2) λοιπὸν ὅτι πάσῃ τῇ δυνάμει τὴν ὁρμὴν ἐπὶ τοὺς κατὰ τὴν Ἑλλάδα τόπους ποιήσονται, λόγῳ μὲν Αἰτωλοῖς βοηθήσοντες κατὰ Φιλίππου, τῇ δ' ἀληθείᾳ πᾶσαν ὑφ' ἑαυτοὺς ποιησόμενοι, καὶ λίαν ⟨ὑπολαμβάνω⟩ τοῦτ' εἶναι καταφανές."

V: Cassius Dio 17.58–59

Ὁ μέντοι Φίλιππος οὐχ ὅσον οὐκ ἐπήρθη τούτῳ, ἀλλὰ καὶ σπείσασθαι τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις ἠθέλησε, καὶ μάλισθ' ὅτι καὶ ὁ Πτολεμαῖος πρέσβεις ἐκ τῆς Αἰγύπτου πέμπων συνήλλαττεν αὐτούς. (59) καί τινων λόγων σφίσι γενομένων . . . [several lines missing] . .. . εἰρήνην οὐκέτι ᾔτησεν ἀλλὰ . . . τοὺς δὲ Αἰτωλοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς συμμαχίας τῆς τῶν Ῥωμαίων ρ . . . τινι ἀποσπάσας φίλους ἐποιήσατο.

VI: The Delos inscription

[- - - c. 12 - - - κα]ὶ δέχεσ[θαι?- - -]
- - - - - - - - - - τὰς διασαφης- - - -
- - - - - - - - -τησάτωσαν σ- - - - - -
- - - - - -ι καὶ οἱ σύμμαχ[οι - - - -]
- - - - - -χοι ἔστωσαν τω- - - - - -
- - - - -σ τὸ τέταρτον ἐα- - - - -
. . . .ν τόπον μήτε νικη- - - - - -
[. . Αἰ]τωλοὶ δὲ Φώκαιαν - - - - -
[. . . β]ασιλέα Φίλιππον κα[ὶ - -]
[. . . . τ]οὺς συνέδρους καὶ - - - -
[. . . . . κα]ὶ Ἡλείων τὰς σ̣τ- - - -
- - - - - -ι καὶ Ἀμύνανδ[ρος - -]
- - - - - -πων τῶν ἑκατ[έρων -]
- - - - - - -ήλους ἀποστ- - - -
- - - - - - - -λον· ἐὰν [δὲ - -]
- - - - - - - -χον νοι- - - - -
- - - - - - - -υσιν- - - - - -
- - - - - - - - \IT - - - - -
- - - - - - - - -T- - - - -

5: [ἔνο]χοι?: Roussel, after Holleaux. || 5–6: [- - στρατηγοῦντο]ς τὸ τέταρτον?: Roussel. || 13: ἑκατ[έρων] or ἑκατ[έρωθεν]: Schmitt.

In the year 209, during the course of the First Macedonian War, Philip V met with ambassadors from Rhodes, Chios, Athens, and Ptolemy IV of Egypt. Aitolian representatives must also have been present at this meeting at Phalara; they are said to have brought with them as a mediator Amynandros, the king of Athamania. The purpose of the mediators was to bring about a peace between Philip and Aitolia, although they may also have envisioned the possibility, if not the likelihood, of being able to draw Rome into the peace negotiations as well.[1] Some of the states involved, in particular Rhodes, of course had the usual economic reasons for wanting a general peace in the Mediterranean; Livy says that the general motivation of the mediators was to keep the great powers of

1. See Rich, p. 145.

Philip, Rome, and Attalos out of Greece.[2] An armistice was signed at Phalara under the auspices of the foreign envoys, and a meeting set for a month later at Aigion, the seat of the Achaian council. At this meeting the mediating embassies were also present, but their attempts failed when Aitolia, heartened by hearing of the proximity of Attalos and its Roman allies, refused to bargain in a fashion that Philip could accept.[3]

The following year, Philip met with envoys from Ptolemy and Rhodes at Elateia. These ambassadors, still trying to bring about a peace between Philip and Aitolia, had previously met with the Aitolians at Herakleia. This may be what Appian refers to as the first meeting of the mediators with the representatives of the Aitolian League in their own venue. Appian says that the envoys came from Chios, Mytilene, and Ptolemy, as well as from Amynandros, who, according to Appian, was apparently not there in person. Presumably the mediators would have obtained a proposal from this meeting at Herakleia, which they would have taken to the meeting with Philip at Elateia. But these discussions met with no more success than those of the previous year.[4]

The conference or conferences of 207 are rather more obscure.[5] Polybios preserves the speech of an ambassador who is attempting to mediate between the two sides. It is possible that this speech was meant to be one given at a second meeting with the Aitolians described by Appian. The ambassador cites the attempts at peacemaking, at least two previous to this one, made by Ptolemy, Rhodes, Byzantion, Chios, and Mytilene.[6] According to Polybios this speech was well received by the Aitolians. Appian implies strongly that the Aitolians would have made peace on both occasions he describes, but that the Romans hindered it. Appian's account of the second meeting of the mediators with the Aitolians, his description of what was said and of the general reaction to the envoys' speech or speeches, tallies with the account of Polybios. Polybios, however, makes no mention of the Roman presence, and Appian no mention of a Macedonian embassy.

2. Starr in particular argues that fear of Attalid ambition often influenced Rhodian policy.

3. Cf. the Aitolian reaction during the Social War (**53**): initially interested in arbitration when their own situation was strategically poor, they apparently backed out when they believed Philip was facing trouble during the Apelles affair.

4. Appian depicts the Roman interest in continuing the war, and Sulpicius's refusal to bargain in good faith, urging the senate to forbid a treaty with Philip. Eckstein (p. 418) argues that the Roman commander Sulpicius was "deeply involved" in the peace process, especially in 207. But Eckstein's view of Rome's willingness to listen to mediation at this stage is too sanguine.

5. For discussions of the chronology of events during these years, see Huss; Schmitt, *Rom und Rhodos*.

6. Cf. the list of states that attempted to mediate between Philip and Aitolia during the Social War (**53**): Chios, Rhodes, Byzantion, and Ptolemy. The speech is attributed to the Rhodian ambassador Thrasykrates; see Will, vol. 2, p. 93.

The Aitolians did eventually (in 206) go ahead and contract a separate peace with Philip. If the inscription cited above has any connection to this treaty, then perhaps it could be argued that the many attempts at mediation between the warring parties did finally pay off. It may be that the appearance of the name Amynandros in this inscription should be seen as a reference to his actions as mediator.[7] Amynandros appeared again in 205, when negotiations were going ahead for the final settlement, the Peace of Phoinike between Philip and Rome.[8]

58. Mediation on the island of Crete (end of the third century)

Two unrelated inscriptions from the end of the third century, both of which refer to mediation services undertaken on Crete, by Magnesia and by a Rhodian ambassador of Antiochos III.

I: A decree of the Epidamnians inscribed at Magnesia. Only the relevant portion is cited here.

Kern, *IMagM* 46; Dittenberger, *SIG*^{2} 259; *Dittenberger, *SIG*^{3} 560.

II: A decree of the Cretan state of Eleutherna; one of a series of inscriptions from the wall of the temple of Dionysos in Teos. Only the relevant portion is cited here.

LeBas/Waddington 71; Böckh, *CIG* 3047; Michel 57; Blass, *SGDI* 5177; *Guarducci, *IC* II.xii, pp. 161–62, no. 21*.

Walbank, *Philip V*, p. 121; Holleaux, *Études*, vol. 4, pp. 174–75, 191f.; E. Mikrogiannakes, Ἡ Κρήτη κατὰ τοὺς Ἑλληνιστικοὺς χρόνους (Athens, 1967) pp. 164–66; H. R. Rawlings, *AJAH* 1 (1976) pp. 17f.; Berthold, p. 108; Ager, *Historia* 40 (1991) pp. 17–20.

I: The Epidamnian decree from Magnesia

10 . . . καὶ τὰν
εὐε[ργ]ecίαν, ἃν [cυ]νετελέcαντο εἰc τὸ κοινὸ[ν] τῶν Κρηταιέ[ων] δι[α]λύcαν-
τεc τὸν ἐμφύλι-
ον πόλεμον . . . .

7. See Roussel's notes; Walbank, *Philip V*, p. 101 n. 1; Oost, p. 5.

8. Livy 29.12.12. Epiros instigated the peace proceedings and, in Livy's account, appears to act as mediator; however, it should not be forgotten that Epiros was technically Macedonia's ally. See N. G. L. Hammond, *Epirus* (Oxford, 1967) pp. 612–13.

The Aitolians did eventually (in 206) go ahead and contract a separate peace with Philip. If the inscription cited above has any connection to this treaty, then perhaps it could be argued that the many attempts at mediation between the warring parties did finally pay off. It may be that the appearance of the name Amynandros in this inscription should be seen as a reference to his actions as mediator.[7] Amynandros appeared again in 205, when negotiations were going ahead for the final settlement, the Peace of Phoinike between Philip and Rome.[8]

58. Mediation on the island of Crete (end of the third century)

Two unrelated inscriptions from the end of the third century, both of which refer to mediation services undertaken on Crete, by Magnesia and by a Rhodian ambassador of Antiochos III.

I: A decree of the Epidamnians inscribed at Magnesia. Only the relevant portion is cited here.

Kern, *IMagM* 46; Dittenberger, *SIG*^{2} 259; *Dittenberger, *SIG*^{3} 560.

II: A decree of the Cretan state of Eleutherna; one of a series of inscriptions from the wall of the temple of Dionysos in Teos. Only the relevant portion is cited here.

LeBas/Waddington 71; Böckh, *CIG* 3047; Michel 57; Blass, *SGDI* 5177; *Guarducci, *IC* II.xii, pp. 161–62, no. 21*.

Walbank, *Philip V*, p. 121; Holleaux, *Études*, vol. 4, pp. 174–75, 191f.; E. Mikrogiannakes, Ἡ Κρήτη κατὰ τοὺς Ἑλληνιστικοὺς χρόνους (Athens, 1967) pp. 164–66; H. R. Rawlings, *AJAH* 1 (1976) pp. 17f.; Berthold, p. 108; Ager, *Historia* 40 (1991) pp. 17–20.

I: The Epidamnian decree from Magnesia

10 . . . καὶ τὰν
εὐε[ργ]ecίαν, ἃν [cυ]νετελέcαντο εἰc τὸ κοινὸ[ν] τῶν Κρηταιέ[ων] δι[α]λύcαν-
τεc τὸν ἐμφύλι-
ον πόλεμον . . . .

7. See Roussel's notes; Walbank, *Philip V*, p. 101 n. 1; Oost, p. 5.

8. Livy 29.12.12. Epiros instigated the peace proceedings and, in Livy's account, appears to act as mediator; however, it should not be forgotten that Epiros was technically Macedonia's ally. See N. G. L. Hammond, *Epirus* (Oxford, 1967) pp. 612–13.

II: The Eleutherneian decree from Teos

. . . . ὁμοίως δὲ παρεκάλ[εσε]
καὶ Ἀγήσανδρος Εὐκράτευς Ῥόδιος ὁ παρὰ τῶ βασι-
λέως Ἀντιόχω πρεσβευτὰς ἐπὶ τὰς τῶ πολέμω
διαλύσεις ἀποσταλείς, οὐθὲν ἐλλείπων σπου-
δᾶς καὶ φιλοτιμίας κατ' οὐθένα τρόπον· ὡσαύτως δὲ
καὶ Περδίκκας ὁ παρὰ τῶ βασιλέως Φιλίππω πεμ-
φθείς· . . . .

These two inscriptions bear no obvious connection to one another beyond the fact that they both make oblique references to efforts expended by foreign mediators on Crete towards the end of the third century. The first document is a decree of Epidamnos recognizing the establishment of the festival of Artemis Leukophryene at Magnesia; it should be dated to around 206. One of the benefactions of the Magnesians, according to the Epidamnian decree, was the provision of their good offices to the *koinon* of the Cretans in putting an end to the ἐμφύλιος πόλεμος, a description that implies a state of internecine warfare on the island. The second inscription, which has been dated to 204/3,[1] comes from a series of epigraphic documents from the temple of Dionysos in Teos, informing us of several successful attempts made by the Teians around the turn of the century to have the right of *asylia* accorded to their sanctuary by other states. Among the states that agreed to recognize this right were some twenty Cretan cities, including Eleutherna. The document excerpted above is a decree of that state. It grants the *asylia* request and mentions incidentally the contemporary presence on Crete of two other foreign diplomats who supported the Teian request: Hagesandros of Rhodes, the ambassador of Antiochos III, and Perdikkas, the agent of Philip V. The inscription gives us the information that Hagesandros had been sent to Crete "to put an end to the war" (lines 15–16).

There is no necessary connection between the presence of Magnesian mediators on Crete and the mandate of Hagesandros the Rhodian. Their missions there could have been separated by a period of several years, and arguments have been adduced by various scholars that would connect each of the two references to different events: the war with Lyttos, the so-called First Cretan War, and a war between Gortyn and Knossos.[2]

One point that has been insufficiently stressed, however, is that the Rhodian Hagesandros was not working primarily as a representative of the Rhodian state. He is called an ambassador of Antiochos III, and the rationale behind

1. See P. Herrmann, *Anadolu* 9 (1965) pp. 29–159.

2. On the Magnesian mediation of the war with Lyttos see Mikrogiannakes. For Hagesandros as settler of the "First Cretan War" between Rhodes and Crete see Holleaux (*Études*, vol. 4, pp. 174–75, 191f.) and Rawlings; on the mediation of Magnesia or Hagesandros in a conflict between Knossos and Gortyn see Rawlings, and cf. **127**.

his mission should be sought in Antiochos's interests rather than in Rhodian concerns. Antiochos had just returned from his Eastern campaigning; his next plans were to reassert himself in Syria. His need for Cretan mercenaries was sufficient reason for him to make an effort to stop the fighting on Crete and preserve its military manpower for his own uses. Still, the Rhodians did have some interest in resolving the late-third-century conflicts on Crete, whether the hostilities involved Rhodes or whether they were limited to the Cretan states themselves. Macedonian influence on Crete was extensive; the Eleutherna inscription informs us that not only Hagesandros, the ambassador of Antiochos, but also one Perdikkas, the ambassador of Philip V, was on Crete at the time. In the last few years of the third century, Rhodian and Macedonian interests in the Aegean were on a collision course. It was to the benefit of Rhodes to settle matters on Crete and prevent the troubles there from draining its own resources any further, just as it was to the benefit of Philip to occupy Rhodes by the indirect means of a Cretan war.[3]

It should be reiterated that there is no imperative reason to link the efforts of the Magnesians and of Hagesandros; both of the epigraphic notices are brief and allusive. Certainly their mediations cannot be exactly contemporaneous. But since the time frame of the two of them is roughly the same, and since the efforts of both are recorded in very similar language, it seems not impossible that there was some connection between the Cretan hostilities attested by both. There may have been no formal relationship between the mediations, but they may have sprung from the same continuing set of circumstances. War was endemic on Crete, and both the Magnesians and Hagesandros could have mediated within a few years of each other, even with some success, in what might have been essentially the same ongoing conflict.

59. Rome demands that Philip V arbitrate his disputes with Attalos I and Rhodes (200)

I: Polybios 16.27.1–3.
II: Polybios 16.34.3–4.

E. J. Bickermann, *RPh* 61 (1935) pp. 161f.; J. A. O. Larsen, *CPh* 32 (1937) pp. 15f.; A. H. McDonald/F. W. Walbank, *JRS* 27 (1937) pp. 189f.; C. G. Starr, *CPh* 33 (1938) pp. 63–68; Walbank, *Philip V*, pp. 127f.; J. P. V. D. Balsdon, *JRS* 44 (1954) pp. 30f.; Badian, *FC*, pp. 66f.; McShane, pp. 122f.; Hansen[2], pp. 56f.; Will, vol. 2,

3. Berthold suggests that Hagesandros's mission was essentially to detach the Cretan cities from their allegiance to Philip V and to undermine Philip's widespread influence on Crete.

his mission should be sought in Antiochos's interests rather than in Rhodian concerns. Antiochos had just returned from his Eastern campaigning; his next plans were to reassert himself in Syria. His need for Cretan mercenaries was sufficient reason for him to make an effort to stop the fighting on Crete and preserve its military manpower for his own uses. Still, the Rhodians did have some interest in resolving the late-third-century conflicts on Crete, whether the hostilities involved Rhodes or whether they were limited to the Cretan states themselves. Macedonian influence on Crete was extensive; the Eleutherna inscription informs us that not only Hagesandros, the ambassador of Antiochos, but also one Perdikkas, the ambassador of Philip V, was on Crete at the time. In the last few years of the third century, Rhodian and Macedonian interests in the Aegean were on a collision course. It was to the benefit of Rhodes to settle matters on Crete and prevent the troubles there from draining its own resources any further, just as it was to the benefit of Philip to occupy Rhodes by the indirect means of a Cretan war.[3]

It should be reiterated that there is no imperative reason to link the efforts of the Magnesians and of Hagesandros; both of the epigraphic notices are brief and allusive. Certainly their mediations cannot be exactly contemporaneous. But since the time frame of the two of them is roughly the same, and since the efforts of both are recorded in very similar language, it seems not impossible that there was some connection between the Cretan hostilities attested by both. There may have been no formal relationship between the mediations, but they may have sprung from the same continuing set of circumstances. War was endemic on Crete, and both the Magnesians and Hagesandros could have mediated within a few years of each other, even with some success, in what might have been essentially the same ongoing conflict.

59. Rome demands that Philip V arbitrate his disputes with Attalos I and Rhodes (200)

I: Polybios 16.27.1–3.
II: Polybios 16.34.3–4.

E. J. Bickermann, *RPh* 61 (1935) pp. 161f.; J. A. O. Larsen, *CPh* 32 (1937) pp. 15f.; A. H. McDonald/F. W. Walbank, *JRS* 27 (1937) pp. 189f.; C. G. Starr, *CPh* 33 (1938) pp. 63–68; Walbank, *Philip V*, pp. 127f.; J. P. V. D. Balsdon, *JRS* 44 (1954) pp. 30f.; Badian, *FC*, pp. 66f.; McShane, pp. 122f.; Hansen[2], pp. 56f.; Will, vol. 2,

3. Berthold suggests that Hagesandros's mission was essentially to detach the Cretan cities from their allegiance to Philip V and to undermine Philip's widespread influence on Crete.

pp. 132–49; Berthold, pp. 125f.; Gruen, pp. 101f., 392f.; Hammond/Walbank, *Macedonia*, vol. 3, pp. 416f.; Ager, *Historia* 40 (1991) pp. 20–22.

I: Polybios 16.27.1–3

Προδιαπεμψάμενοι πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι κήρυκα συνέμιξαν αὐτῷ (2) καὶ παρεκάλεσαν ἀναγγεῖλαι τῷ Φιλίππῳ διότι Ῥωμαῖοι παρακαλοῦσι τὸν βασιλέα τῶν μὲν Ἑλλήνων μηδενὶ πολεμεῖν, τῶν δὲ γεγονότων εἰς Ἄτταλον ἀδικημάτων δίκας ὑπέχειν ἐν ἴσῳ κριτηρίῳ, (3) καὶ διότι πράξαντι μὲν ταῦτα τὴν εἰρήνην ἄγειν ἔξεστι πρὸς Ῥωμαίους, μὴ βουλομένῳ δὲ πείθεσθαι τἀναντία συνεξακολουθήσειν ἔφασαν.

II: Polybios 16.34.3–4

Ὅς καὶ συμμίξας περὶ τὴν Ἄβυδον διεσάφει τῷ βασιλεῖ διότι δέδοκται τῇ συγκλήτῳ παρακαλεῖν αὐτὸν μήτε τῶν Ἑλλήνων μηδενὶ πολεμεῖν μήτε τοῖς Πτολεμαίου πράγμασιν ἐπιβάλλειν τὰς χεῖρας, περὶ δὲ τῶν εἰς Ἄτταλον καὶ Ῥοδίους ἀδικημάτων δίκας ὑποσχεῖν, (4) καὶ διότι ταῦτα μὲν οὕτω πράττοντι τὴν εἰρήνην ἄγειν ἐξέσται, μὴ βουλομένῳ δὲ πειθαρχεῖν ἑτοίμως ὑπάρξειν τὸν πρὸς Ῥωμαίους πόλεμον.

In the autumn of 201, Pergamon and Rhodes dispatched embassies to Rome in order to complain to the senate of Philip V's ambitions. Although an Aitolian embassy that had requested Roman support against Philip's aggressions had failed miserably only a year before, the Pergamene and Rhodian ambassadors met with a positive response. The Romans promised to investigate and sent a commission to the East consisting of C. Claudius Nero, M. Aemilius Lepidus, and P. Sempronius Tuditanus. The senate may already have determined on war with Philip but may have been as yet unable to convince the Roman people.[1] The legates were certainly sent out with a view to preparing the ground for potential hostilities.[2] The commission visited various points in Greece, publicizing the senate's intentions towards Philip; while it was staying in Athens in the spring of 200, a Macedonian force overran the Attic countryside and forced the Roman hand. The legates delivered the first "ultimatum" to Philip's general Nikanor. Philip was to cease from making war on any of the Greeks and was to submit to the judgement of a neutral tribunal with respect to the wrongs he had committed against Attalos. Otherwise the Macedonian king would have to face Roman hostility.

1. See Walbank, *Philip V*, pp. 127f.; and see Gruen, pp. 391f., for a discussion of the causes of the Second Macedonian War.

2. This may have included an attempt to have the Rhodians employ their diplomatic services to get the rejected Aitolians back into the Roman camp, if V. Kontorini's recent interpretation of a fragmented Rhodian inscription is to be accepted (*JRS* 73 [1983] pp. 24–32; cf. Robert, *REG* 1984, 294).

The legates then removed to Rhodes, where they spent most of the summer. It was probably during the summer that the Roman people were persuaded to declare a war against Philip. When Aemilius Lepidus sailed north at the end of the summer to confront Philip at the siege of Abydos and deliver the second ultimatum personally, he was assured of Roman military action if Philip should be recalcitrant. Hence the second ultimatum had a more forceful tone. Philip was to cease making war on the Greeks and keep his hands off Ptolemaic possessions. He was also to submit to arbitration with respect to the injuries done to Rhodes and Attalos. Otherwise, the Romans would make war on him. Philip of course refused the ultimatum, and the Second Macedonian War was the result.

The entire episode seems to have been a propaganda exercise on the part of Rome, inspired no doubt by the interests and demands of Rhodes and Attalos. It seems certain that the Romans were already determined on war; and the ultimatum delivered to Philip was not consonant with Greek notions of arbitration. The subject of the potential arbitration was Philip's ἀδικήματα against Rhodes and Attalos, a term that indicates that a tribunal would not rule on the justice of the claims of both sides but rather would simply assess penalties against Philip. This view is substantiated by the anecdote Polybios reports about Lepidus. After he had delivered the ultimatum, Philip attempted to defend the justice of his position and point out the technical aggressions of his enemies. He was interrupted, in truly brusque Roman fashion, by the youthful legate, and his arguments ignored (Polyb. 16.34.5–7). The response of Lepidus indicates that Philip stood no chance of upholding his own claims even if he did agree to arbitration.

60. Rome intervenes between Antiochos III and Ptolemy V (200)

I: Polybios 16.27.5.
II: Livy 31.2.3–4.
III: Appian *Macedonica* 4.2.
IV: Justin 30.3–31.1.

Holleaux, *Monarchies hellénistiques*, pp. 58–59, 320f.; A. H. McDonald/F. W. Walbank, *JRS* 27 (1937) pp. 204–7; Walbank, *Philip V*, pp. 313–16; J. P. V. D. Balsdon, *JRS* 44 (1954) pp. 39–41; Holleaux, *Études*, vol. 5, pp. 350f.; E. Badian, *CPh* 54 (1959) pp. 81–99; Will, vol. 2, pp. 119–20; Mehl, pp. 145–46.

The legates then removed to Rhodes, where they spent most of the summer. It was probably during the summer that the Roman people were persuaded to declare a war against Philip. When Aemilius Lepidus sailed north at the end of the summer to confront Philip at the siege of Abydos and deliver the second ultimatum personally, he was assured of Roman military action if Philip should be recalcitrant. Hence the second ultimatum had a more forceful tone. Philip was to cease making war on the Greeks and keep his hands off Ptolemaic possessions. He was also to submit to arbitration with respect to the injuries done to Rhodes and Attalos. Otherwise, the Romans would make war on him. Philip of course refused the ultimatum, and the Second Macedonian War was the result.

The entire episode seems to have been a propaganda exercise on the part of Rome, inspired no doubt by the interests and demands of Rhodes and Attalos. It seems certain that the Romans were already determined on war; and the ultimatum delivered to Philip was not consonant with Greek notions of arbitration. The subject of the potential arbitration was Philip's ἀδικήματα against Rhodes and Attalos, a term that indicates that a tribunal would not rule on the justice of the claims of both sides but rather would simply assess penalties against Philip. This view is substantiated by the anecdote Polybios reports about Lepidus. After he had delivered the ultimatum, Philip attempted to defend the justice of his position and point out the technical aggressions of his enemies. He was interrupted, in truly brusque Roman fashion, by the youthful legate, and his arguments ignored (Polyb. 16.34.5–7). The response of Lepidus indicates that Philip stood no chance of upholding his own claims even if he did agree to arbitration.

60. Rome intervenes between Antiochos III and Ptolemy V (200)

I: Polybios 16.27.5.
II: Livy 31.2.3–4.
III: Appian *Macedonica* 4.2.
IV: Justin 30.3–31.1.

Holleaux, *Monarchies hellénistiques*, pp. 58–59, 320f.; A. H. McDonald/F. W. Walbank, *JRS* 27 (1937) pp. 204–7; Walbank, *Philip V*, pp. 313–16; J. P. V. D. Balsdon, *JRS* 44 (1954) pp. 39–41; Holleaux, *Études*, vol. 5, pp. 350f.; E. Badian, *CPh* 54 (1959) pp. 81–99; Will, vol. 2, pp. 119–20; Mehl, pp. 145–46.

I: Polybios 16.27.5

Τότε δὲ διὰ τοῦ Νικάνορος τῷ Φιλίππῳ ταῦτα δηλώσαντες αὐτοὶ μὲν ἀπέπλευσαν ὡς Ἀντίοχον καὶ Πτολεμαῖον ἐπὶ τὰς διαλύσεις.

II: Livy 31.2.3–4

Interim ad Ptolomaeum Aegypti regem legati tres missi, C. Claudius Nero, M. Aemilius Lepidus, P. Sempronius Tuditanus, ut nuntiarent victum Hannibalem Poenosque et gratias agerent regi, (4) quod in rebus dubiis, cum finitimi etiam socii Romanos desererent, in fide mansisset, et peterent ut, si coacti iniuriis bellum adversus Philippum suscepissent, pristinum animum erga populum Romanum conservaret.

III: Appian *Macedonica* 4.2

Ῥωμαῖοι δ' Αἰτωλοῖς ἐμέμψαντο τῆς οὐ πρὸ πολλοῦ μεταβολῆς, πρέσβεις δ' ἐς τοὺς βασιλέας ἔπεμπον, οἳ προηγόρευον αὐτοῖς Ἀντίοχον μὲν Αἰγύπτῳ μὴ ἐπιχειρεῖν, Φίλιππον δὲ μηδὲν ἐς Ῥοδίους ἢ Ἀθηναίους ἢ Ἄτταλον ἢ ἐς ἄλλον τινὰ Ῥωμαίων φίλον ἁμαρτάνειν.

IV: Justin 30.3–31.1

Mittuntur itaque legati, qui Philippo et Antiocho denuntient, regno Aegypti abstineant. mittitur et M. Lepidus in Aegyptum, qui tutorio nomine regnum pupilli administret. . . . [31.1] mortuo Ptolomeo Philopatore, rege Aegypti, contemptaque parvuli filii eius aetate, qui in spem regni relictus praeda etiam domesticis erat, Antiochus, rex Syriae, occupare Aegyptum statuit. itaque Phoenicen ceterasque Syriae quidem, sed iuris Aegypti civitates cum invasisset, legatos ad eum senatus mittit, qui denuntiarent ei, abstineret regno pupilli postremis patris precibus fidei suae traditi. quibus spretis interiecto tempore alia legatio supervenit, quae omissa pupilli persona civitates iure belli factas populi Romani in integrum restitui iubebat. abnuenti bellum denuntiatum, quod ille facile susceptum infeliciter gessit.

Polybios tells us that when the Roman legation of Nero, Lepidus, and Tuditanus had delivered their first "ultimatum" to Philip's general Nikanor in the spring of 200, they then set out to bring about peace between Antiochos the Great and the youthful Ptolemy Epiphanes. Livy also reports that this embassy was sent, although he asserts that its motive was to inform Ptolemy of the final Carthaginian defeat at Zama, and to solicit Egyptian support in case of a war with Philip. Appian and Justin intimate that the embassy was directed, not to Ptolemy and Antiochos, but rather to Philip and Antiochos, and that its purpose was to warn the Macedonian and Seleukid kings against aggression in Egypt rather than to attempt to put an end to the Fifth Syrian War.

As all the sources, except Livy, tell the story, the Roman action was intended to serve the best interests of Egypt. The threatening Seleukid was warned off

from Egyptian territory itself, or, as Polybios relates it, the legation intended to mediate or arbitrate a settlement in the Syrian conflict. In any case the Roman embassy appears disinterested, as a true mediator should be. But in reality, the Roman action was probably undertaken very much in the Roman interest. The real intention, as it appears from their later actions, was to secure the neutrality of Antiochos in the face of the coming war with Philip.[1] Far from demanding that Antiochos not invade Egypt, the Romans may have been willing to sacrifice Egypt, a negligible ally in 200, in order to buy Seleukid neutrality. Polybios implies that Lepidus and his companions travelled on to Syria and Egypt directly after their sojourn in Athens in the spring of 200. Hence they should have sounded out Antiochos prior to the delivery of their final ultimatum to Philip at Abydos in the late summer of 200. This might account for the appearance in the second ultimatum of a concern for Ptolemy's interests that had been lacking in the first.[2]

61. The Achaian League offers to mediate between Philip V and Rhodes (200)

Polybios 16.35.1–2.

C. G. Starr, *CPh* 33 (1938) pp. 63–68; Walbank, *Philip V*, p. 135; McShane, p. 127; Gruen, p. 442; Ager, *Historia* 40 (1991) pp. 21–22.

Ὅτι παρῆσαν μετὰ τὴν ἅλωσιν Ἀβύδου παρὰ τοῦ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν ἔθνους εἰς τὴν Ῥόδον πρεσβευταί, παρακαλοῦντες τὸν δῆμον εἰς τὰς πρὸς τὸν Φίλιππον διαλύσεις. (2) οἷς ἐπελθόντων ⟨τῶν⟩ ἐκ τῆς Ῥώμης πρεσβευτῶν καὶ διαλεγομένων ὑπὲρ τοῦ μὴ ποιεῖσθαι διαλύσεις πρὸς Φίλιππον ἄνευ Ῥωμαίων, ἔδοξε προσέχειν τῷ δήμῳ τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις καὶ στοχάζεσθαι τῆς τούτων φιλίας.

Immediately on the heels of the Roman ultimatum of 200 to Philip at Abydos came an effort on the part of the Achaians to mediate between Philip and the Rhodians. The Achaians were longtime allies of Philip, if not always his most enthusiastic supporters. At this juncture they apparently did not wish to be pulled into what was beginning to look like a potentially major conflict between Philip and Rome.[1] They therefore attempted to bring about

1. Holleaux, *Monarchies hellénistiques*, p. 59. See also Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 2, p. 534; id., *Philip V*, p. 316; Will, vol. 2, p. 120.

2. Walbank, however, believes that the legates carried out their Eastern mission after Lepidus had returned from Abydos (*Philip V*, p. 316). It is also not known whether the legation arrived before or after Antiochos's victory over the Egyptian forces at Panion. See Will, vol. 2, p. 120.

1. See Gruen's comments, p. 442.

from Egyptian territory itself, or, as Polybios relates it, the legation intended to mediate or arbitrate a settlement in the Syrian conflict. In any case the Roman embassy appears disinterested, as a true mediator should be. But in reality, the Roman action was probably undertaken very much in the Roman interest. The real intention, as it appears from their later actions, was to secure the neutrality of Antiochos in the face of the coming war with Philip.[1] Far from demanding that Antiochos not invade Egypt, the Romans may have been willing to sacrifice Egypt, a negligible ally in 200, in order to buy Seleukid neutrality. Polybios implies that Lepidus and his companions travelled on to Syria and Egypt directly after their sojourn in Athens in the spring of 200. Hence they should have sounded out Antiochos prior to the delivery of their final ultimatum to Philip at Abydos in the late summer of 200. This might account for the appearance in the second ultimatum of a concern for Ptolemy's interests that had been lacking in the first.[2]

61. The Achaian League offers to mediate between Philip V and Rhodes (200)

Polybios 16.35.1–2.

C. G. Starr, *CPh* 33 (1938) pp. 63–68; Walbank, *Philip V*, p. 135; McShane, p. 127; Gruen, p. 442; Ager, *Historia* 40 (1991) pp. 21–22.

Ὅτι παρῆσαν μετὰ τὴν ἅλωσιν Ἀβύδου παρὰ τοῦ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν ἔθνους εἰς τὴν Ῥόδον πρεσβευταί, παρακαλοῦντες τὸν δῆμον εἰς τὰς πρὸς τὸν Φίλιππον διαλύσεις. (2) οἷς ἐπελθόντων ⟨τῶν⟩ ἐκ τῆς Ῥώμης πρεσβευτῶν καὶ διαλεγομένων ὑπὲρ τοῦ μὴ ποιεῖσθαι διαλύσεις πρὸς Φίλιππον ἄνευ Ῥωμαίων, ἔδοξε προσέχειν τῷ δήμῳ τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις καὶ στοχάζεσθαι τῆς τούτων φιλίας.

Immediately on the heels of the Roman ultimatum of 200 to Philip at Abydos came an effort on the part of the Achaians to mediate between Philip and the Rhodians. The Achaians were longtime allies of Philip, if not always his most enthusiastic supporters. At this juncture they apparently did not wish to be pulled into what was beginning to look like a potentially major conflict between Philip and Rome.[1] They therefore attempted to bring about

1. Holleaux, *Monarchies hellénistiques*, p. 59. See also Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 2, p. 534; id., *Philip V*, p. 316; Will, vol. 2, p. 120.

2. Walbank, however, believes that the legates carried out their Eastern mission after Lepidus had returned from Abydos (*Philip V*, p. 316). It is also not known whether the legation arrived before or after Antiochos's victory over the Egyptian forces at Panion. See Will, vol. 2, p. 120.

1. See Gruen's comments, p. 442.

peace between Philip and Rhodes at the least. But the Roman commission that had delivered the ultimatum to Philip was still in Rhodes in the early fall of 200 and managed to forestall their efforts. The Romans were now officially at war with Philip. They had no desire to be deserted by a state that had played an important part in instigating the present situation, and that might have seemed now to be displaying diminished enthusiasm for the undertaking.[2]

62. An arbitration between Chyretiai and Erikinion (c. 200?)

A fragmented inscription from a column drum discovered in Thessaly. H: 0.57 m; diam.: 0.60 m.

*****A. Arvanitopoulos, *AE* 1917, pp. 15–18, no. 308.

Stählin, p. 28; W. W. Tarn/G. T. Griffith, *Hellenistic Civilization*[3] (London, 1952) p. 81; A. S. McDevitt, *Inscriptions from Thessaly* (Hildesheim, 1970) 1132.

[- - - - νεμ]όν[των? - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
[- - - - - ν]έ[μ]ο[ντ]αι [τὰ - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
[- - - - - - - ἱ]ερὰ[c - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
[δεῖνα C?]ό[λ]ωνο[c] Φ[αλ]ανν[α]ῖο[c - - - - - - - - - - - -]
5 [- - - -c]ι τ[ὰ]c K[acc]άνδρου τοῦ Ἀν[τιπάτρου - - - - - - -]
[- - - -ε]ν[ο]ν κ[ύ]ρι[οι] ἐ[ό]ντω Χυρετιεῖc - - - - - - - - - -
[- - - -τ]α [τ . . . ν]ι[κώ?]ντω, ἐ[ὰ]ν δὲ μὴ ἐν[έχωνται? - -]
[- ἔνθα - -μ]ω[ν τέθ]απται, [κ]ύριοι ἐό[ν]τω Ἐρι[κινεῖc - - -]
[- - - - ἐγ]ρά[ψα]ν[τ]ο καὶ τ[αφῆν]α[ι], ν[ι]κώντω κ[ατὰ - -]
10 [- - - ἔν]ο[χ]ο[ν] Δε[ινοκ]ρά[τ]ο[υc? οἱ] ἡτ[τ]ώ[μενοι - - - -]
[- - κ]α[ὶ τ]ῆ[c] Κας[cάνδ]ρου το[ῦ Ἀντιπάτρου - - - - - - -]
- - - - -ατ . . ὁ [νι?κ]ῶν, ὁ ἡ[τ]τ[ώμ]ε[νοc - - - - - - - -]
- - - -α [X]υρετι[εῖc . . . ν]ε[ικ . . .]ε . . . π- - - - - - - - -
- - - τό[c]ον Ἐρ[ικινέω]ν ἡ[ττωμ]έ[νων . .]ο- - - - - - - -
15 [- - κ]αὶ τὸ[ν - - - - -] ὁρκ[ιζέcθω] κρ[ῖ]ναι [c- - - - - - -]
[- - -ν]ακο- - - - - - -ανο[. . κρ]ινε[ῖ - - -]ω- - - - - - -
[- - νικ]ώ[ντ]ω - - - - - ν[ικ]ήc[η] τ[ὸ]ν ἀπολω[λότα - - -]
- - - -ι[- - - - - - ὁ ν]ό[μ]οc [δ- - - -]τ[ε .] δε ἐν - - - - -
- - - - - - - - -τι τοῦ ἀ[π]ολωλό[τ]οc ἢ ἀνα[γρα - - - - - -]
20 [- - - - - - - - - - (Δ) δε]ξά[μ]ε[νὸc - - - τ]οῦ Cωc[ικ . .]
[- - - - - - - - - Ἐρικι]ν[έ]ω[ν - - ἐν]αν[τί]ο[c ἔ]cτ[ω . . . .]

3: [ἱ]ερὰ[ν χώραν]?

2. See Starr, p. 68; cf. McShane, p. 127.

peace between Philip and Rhodes at the least. But the Roman commission that had delivered the ultimatum to Philip was still in Rhodes in the early fall of 200 and managed to forestall their efforts. The Romans were now officially at war with Philip. They had no desire to be deserted by a state that had played an important part in instigating the present situation, and that might have seemed now to be displaying diminished enthusiasm for the undertaking.[2]

62. An arbitration between Chyretiai and Erikinion (c. 200?)

A fragmented inscription from a column drum discovered in Thessaly. H: 0.57 m; diam.: 0.60 m.

*****A. Arvanitopoulos, *AE* 1917, pp. 15–18, no. 308.

Stählin, p. 28; W. W. Tarn/G. T. Griffith, *Hellenistic Civilization*[3] (London, 1952) p. 81; A. S. McDevitt, *Inscriptions from Thessaly* (Hildesheim, 1970) 1132.

[- - - - νεμ]όν[των? - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
[- - - - - ν]έ[μ]ο[ντ]αι [τὰ - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
[- - - - - - - ἱ]ερὰ[c - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
[δεῖνα C?]ό[λ]ωνο[c] Φ[αλ]ανν[α]ῖο[c - - - - - - - - - - - -]
5 [- - - -c]ι τ[ὰ]c K[acc]άνδρου τοῦ Ἀν[τιπάτρου - - - - - - -]
[- - - -ε]ν[ο]ν κ[ύ]ρι[οι] ἐ[ό]ντω Χυρετιεῖc - - - - - - - - - -
[- - - -τ]α [τ . . . ν]ι[κώ?]ντω, ἐ[ὰ]ν δὲ μὴ ἐν[έχωνται? - -]
[- ἔνθα - -μ]ω[ν τέθ]απται, [κ]ύριοι ἐό[ν]τω Ἐρι[κινεῖc - - -]
[- - - - ἐγ]ρά[ψα]ν[τ]ο καὶ τ[αφῆν]α[ι], ν[ι]κώντω κ[ατὰ - -]
10 [- - - ἔν]ο[χ]ο[ν] Δε[ινοκ]ρά[τ]ο[υc? οἱ] ἡτ[τ]ώ[μενοι - - - -]
[- - κ]α[ὶ τ]ῆ[c] Κας[cάνδ]ρου το[ῦ Ἀντιπάτρου - - - - - - -]
- - - - -ατ . . ὁ [νι?κ]ῶν, ὁ ἡ[τ]τ[ώμ]ε[νοc - - - - - - - -]
- - - -α [X]υρετι[εῖc . . . ν]ε[ικ . . .]ε . . . π- - - - - - - - -
- - - τό[c]ον Ἐρ[ικινέω]ν ἡ[ττωμ]έ[νων . .]ο- - - - - - - -
15 [- - κ]αὶ τὸ[ν - - - - -] ὁρκ[ιζέcθω] κρ[ῖ]ναι [c- - - - - - -]
[- - -ν]ακο- - - - - - -ανο[. . κρ]ινε[ῖ - - -]ω- - - - - - -
[- - νικ]ώ[ντ]ω - - - - - ν[ικ]ήc[η] τ[ὸ]ν ἀπολω[λότα - - -]
- - - -ι[- - - - - - ὁ ν]ό[μ]οc [δ- - - -]τ[ε .] δε ἐν - - - - -
- - - - - - - - -τι τοῦ ἀ[π]ολωλό[τ]οc ἢ ἀνα[γρα - - - - - -]
20 [- - - - - - - - - - (Δ) δε]ξά[μ]ε[νὸc - - - τ]οῦ Cωc[ικ . .]
[- - - - - - - - - Ἐρικι]ν[έ]ω[ν - - ἐν]αν[τί]ο[c ἔ]cτ[ω . . . .]

3: [ἱ]ερὰ[ν χώραν]?

2. See Starr, p. 68; cf. McShane, p. 127.

This inscription evidently recorded an arbitration between the two neighbouring Perrhaibian towns of Erikinion and Chyretiai. The issue was, as so often, the subject of their mutual boundary. It is also possible that there was a matter of sacred land involved, and a disputed occupation of it. In addition to identifying the two states that were parties to the arbitration, the inscription also mentions a certain Phalannaian citizen, a son of Solon (?). Phalanna was a community on the opposite side of Chyretiai from Erikinion, to the northeast; the son of Solon may have acted as a witness or a judge.[1] The inscription also refers to Kassander, the son of Antipater. The reference to the dynast at first glance would indicate that he may have been involved in this minor boundary arbitration in some such way as Philip V was involved in that between Gonnoi and Herakleion (**54**). The editor, however, believed that this inscription could not be dated as early as the period around 300 B.C. He therefore conjectured that the inscription may be referring to an older arbitration agreement or treaty, concluded under the auspices of Kassander or his agent. This older agreement was then brought up at the later date, either in order to regulate the process of the current arbitration by reference to procedural guidelines or perhaps to provide evidence for one of the disputants of a favourable judgement in the past.[2]

The inscription does not tell us who was responsible for this arbitration, which Arvanitopoulos dated to the years around 200. If it took place in the years during or shortly before the Second Macedonian War, then we should probably assume a Macedonian connection of some kind. It is possible that, as with Gonnoi and Herakleion, this arbitration was the result of a διάγραμμα of Philip V, who in turn may have made reference to a ruling by one of his forerunners as king of Macedon. On the other hand, if the arbitration postdates Philip's defeat, then another obvious possibility for the identity of the arbitrator(s) presents itself. After Kynoskephalai in 197, the Romans under Flamininus devoted a fair amount of time and labour to the "settlement" of Greece. Among the matters dealt with by Flamininus were arbitrations of disputes dividing the various Greek communities.[3] It is possible that Flamininus himself or his delegates may have been responsible for arbitrating between Erikinion and Chyretiai. We have other evidence connecting Flamininus with Chyretiai in this period: a letter of his, dated between 197 and 194, regulated the internal affairs of that state.[4]

1. Arvanitopoulos (p. 17) suggested that the man of Phalanna may have acted as a witness. However, there is nothing in the inscription to indicate that he could not have acted in the capacity of a judge between his two neighbouring communities.

2. Cf. the Samos-Priene arbitrations (**26**, **74**, **99**, **160**) for the use of previous arbitral judgements as support for one's position.

3. See **76**, **79**.

4. See *SIG*^{3} 593.

63. Judges from Miletos and Rhodes arbitrate between Hermione and Epidauros (c. 200)

This document consists of two judgements, the first (lines 1–23) that of Milesian dikasts, the second (lines 24–42) of Rhodian. The text here is based on that of Peek (*MDAI(A)* 59 [1934]), with later corrections and additions; Peek's text was a composite of the several fragments of these two judgements found in the Asklepieion at Epidauros (*IG* IV^2 1.75) and the more complete copy of the same inscription found at Hermione. For epigraphic information, see Hiller von Gaertringen, *IG* IV^2 1.75; Peek, *MDAI(A)* 59 (1934) pp. 47–48 and *ASAW* 60.2 (1969) pp. 26–27.

Fränkel, *IG* IV.927 (Epidauros); Hiller von Gaertringen, *IG* IV^2 1.75 (Epidauros); *W. Peek, *MDAI(A)* 59 (1934) pp. 47–52; id., *ASAW* 60.2 (1969) pp. 26–27, no. 30; A. Wilhelm, *AAWW* 85 (1948), pp. 57–80; *SEG* XI.377, 405 (after Peek and Wilhelm); Moretti, *ISE* 43; Daverio Rocchi 15.2 (lines 10–19).

Wilhelm, *Neue Beiträge* 1, pp. 26–32; Raeder 60; Tod 12; Steinwenter, p. 179; Flacelière/Robert, *REG* 1938, 119; Robert, *REG* 1949, 68; M. Jameson, *Hesperia* 22 (1953) pp. 160–67, no. 15; Robert, *REG* 1954, 116; Guarducci, *Epigrafia greca*, pp. 556–57; *SEG* XXV.375; M. Mitsos, *AE* 1979, pp. 214–17; B. Bravo, *ASNP* 3.10.3 (1980) pp. 866–67; *SEG* XXXI.328; Robert, *REG* 1982, 176; Gruen, p. 109; Daverio Rocchi, pp. 156–61; Ager, *Historia* 40 (1991) p. 22.

[Κα]τὰ τάδε ἐπέκριναν καὶ cυνέλυcαν οἱ Μιλήcιοι δικα-
[cτ]αὶ λαβόντες παρ' ἑκα[τ]έρων τὴν ἐπ[ιτρ]οπήν
Ζήνιππος ˅ Γονγύλου ˅ Φαινοκλῆc ˅ Πολυcτίδ[α]
Δημήτριος ˅ Μαιανδρίου ˅ Δημήτριος ˅ Ἰcτιαίου
5 Ἡγέλοχος ˅ Θεμιcτοκλέος ˅ Ἀνθιάδης ˅ Cίμου·
παραληφθέντες ἐκ Κλείτορος ὑπὸ τῶν ἐξαποcταλ[έν]-
των ἀνδρῶν, ἐγ μὲν Ἑρμιόνος ˅ [Φ]ίλωνος ˅ τοῦ
Καλλιcτράτου ˅ Μενεκράτους ˅ τοῦ Μενεκράτους, ˅ ἐγ δὲ
Ἐπιδαύρου ˅ Δαμ[ο]κλέος ˅ τοῦ Καλλιμένεος ˅ [Τ]ιμαινέτου
10 τοῦ Καλλίκωντος ˅ καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺc διαμφιcβητουμένους τό-
πους ἐπελθόντες κατὰ τὴν γενομένην περιήγηcιν ὑφ' ἑ-
κατέρων ἐπεκρίναμεν ἐπὶ cυνλύcει περὶ ἧc προεκαλέc[α]-
το χώρας ἡ πόλις τῶν Ἑρμιονέων τὴν πόλιν τῶν Ἐπιδαυρ(ί)-
ων τῆc τε κατὰ Cελλᾶντα καὶ Ἀγρίους Λιμένας ἄχρι τοῦ
15 Cτρουθοῦντος· εἶναι ταύτην κοινὴν Ἑρμιονέων καὶ Ἐπιδαυρίων
οὖcαν τῆc Διδυμίας κατὰ τοὺc ὅρουc, οἵ εἰcιν βολεοὶ λίθοι κείμε-
νοι ἀπὸ τῆc καλουμένης Φιλανορείας καὶ κατ' ἄχρας τὰc κολού-
ρας ἕως τοῦ Cτρουθοῦντος κατ' εὐθυορίαν ἕως εἰc θάλαccαν
τὰ πρὸc νότον ὡc ὕδατα καταρεῖ. εἰ δέ τινα ἐπιτίμια ἐ[π]ακολ[ου]-
20 θεῖ ταῖc πόλεcιν, ἤρθαι ταῦτα. περὶ δὲ τῶν καρπείων καὶ τῶν
ἐπινομῶν τῶν πρὸ τῆc χρίcεωc μὴ εἶναι μηδετέροις ἔγκλη-

μα μηθέν. τὸ δὲ γεγονὸς πρότερον κρίμα περὶ τῶν αἰγῶν πρὸ-
ς τοὺς τελώνας κύριον ἔστω.
Κατὰ τάδε ἐπέκριναν οἱ Ῥόδιο[ι] καὶ συ[νέλυσαν λαβόντες]
παρ' ἑκατέρων τὰν ἐπι[τροπάν·] Οἰβ- - - - - - - - - -
Διοπείθε[ος, -]
Κάρπωνο[ς, -]
Σωσίππ[ου, -]
ἄνθε[ος, - - παραληφθέντες κτλ. καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς διαμφισβητουμένους τόπους]
[ἐπελθόντες, κατὰ τὰν γενομέναν περιάγησιν ὑφ' ἑκατέρων]
[ἐπεκρίν]αμε[ν ἐπὶ συ]γ[λύ]σε[ι περὶ ἃς προεκαλέσατο χώρας ἁ πό]-
λις ἁ τῶν Ἑρμιονέων τὰν π[όλιν τὰν τῶν Ἐπιδαυρίων τᾶς τε κατὰ]
Σελλᾶντα καὶ Ἀγρίους Λιμένας [ἄχρι Στρου⟨θοῦ⟩]ντ[ος· εἶμεν ταύταν]
κοινὰν Ἑρμιονέων καὶ Ἐπιδαυρίων [οὖσαν] τᾶς Δι[δυμίας κατὰ]
τοὺς ὅρους, οἳ ἐντι βολεοὶ λίθων κ[είμενο]ι ἀπὸ τᾶ[ς καλουμένας]
Φιλανορείας καὶ κατ' ἄκραν τὰν Κ[ολού]ραν ἕως [τοῦ Στρουθοῦν]-
τος κατ' εὐθυορίαν ἕως εἰς θάλασσ[αν], τὰ ποτὶ ν[ότον ὡς ὕδατα]
καταρεῖ. εἰ δέ τινα ἐπιτίμια ἐπ[ακολ]ουθεῖ ταῖς π[όλεσιν, ἄρθαι ταῦ]-
τα.—περὶ δὲ τῶν καρπείων καὶ τ[ᾶν ἐπι]νομᾶν τᾶ[ν πρὸ τᾶς κρίσιος]
μὴ εἶμεν μηδετέροις ἔγκλη[μα κατ'] ἀλλάλων μ[ηθέν.—τὸ δὲ γε]-
γονὸς κρίμα πρότερον πε[ρὶ τᾶν] αἰγῶν πο[τὶ τοὺς τελώνας]
κύριον ἔστω.

The first part of this text (lines 1–25) is based on the fuller Hermione inscription; the underlined sections indicate those portions of the Hermione copy that are also found in the Epidaurian copy; lines 27f. are to be found only in the Epidauros inscription. Since the disposition on the stones of the two copies was slightly different, and since the first half of this text is based on the Hermione inscription and the second half on the Epidauros one, this composite does not exactly reflect either of them as a whole in terms of line divisions.

25: Οἰβ[αλος]: Wilhelm. || 26: Τιμασικράτεος $^{vac.}$ Θρ- -: Hermione copy (Peek). || 29f.: παραλ[ηφθέντες ἐκ Κλείτορος ὑπὸ τῶν ἐξαποσταλέντ]ων δικαστ[αγωγῶν, ἐγ μὲν Ἑρμιόνος ^{v} Φίλωνος ^{v} τοῦ Καλλιστρά]του ^{v} Μενε[κράτους ^{v} τοῦ Μενεκράτους]: Mitsos.

The two judgements recorded in this document, one in the Ionian κοινή of the Milesians, the other in the Doric dialect of the Rhodians, were handed down in the case of a boundary dispute between the two towns of Epidauros and Hermione.[1] Six Milesian judges came at the request of Epidauros and Hermione, which had sent two ambassadors each. These embassies found the Milesians in the town of Kleitor in Arkadia.

1. Prior to the article of Wilhelm (*Neue Beiträge*), and the later discovery of the Hermione copy, it had been thought that Hermione's opponent here was Kleonai (Fränkel, *IG* IV.927; Raeder). Wilhelm, however, pointed out that a border dispute between Hermione and Kleonai was impossible; cf. Tod. For the date of this arbitration (end of the third century) see Mitsos.

As the Rhodian judgement is word for word exactly the same as the Milesian one, it may be that the Milesians and Rhodians formed a mixed tribunal and handed down one judgement. The even number of judges from Miletos is unusual, but certainly not unprecedented; usually precautions were taken to have an odd number of judges. If the representatives from both Miletos and Rhodes formed one tribunal, and the number of Rhodian judges was odd, this may have remedied the situation.[2] If we assume the two states formed one tribunal, then it seems strange that they should record their findings separately.[3] Nevertheless, if we wish to see here two separate tribunals, one of which might have formed a court of appeal from the judgement of the other, it is even more strange that we find no record of such an appeal. A second tribunal might have upheld the decision of the first in all its points, but if so, we would simply expect to find it recorded that the judgement of the first tribunal (from whatever state) was to stand, not to find a complete repetition of the findings of that first court.[4] On balance, it seems more reasonable to suppose that the Milesians and Rhodians formed something akin to a bicameral commission. In the final settlement there was clearly a consensus of opinion, but the workings of the Milesian and Rhodian tribunals may have been mutually independent in order to ensure fairness.[5]

The judges made a survey of the disputed territory in the company of envoys from both sides. The court was obliged, as usual, both to make a judgement and to set the boundaries of the disputed territory. In this case, the decision was that the land was to be held in common by the two states.[6] In addition to the decision about the land, regulations were set down cancelling fines and prohibiting claims between the two parties that antedated the judgement.

It seems that the two disputants had decided between themselves, upon Hermione's challenge to Epidauros (lines 12–13), to refer the dispute and its settlement to Rhodes and Miletos. Although both Hermione and Epidauros were members of the Achaian League at this time (the end of the third century), and it is clear in other cases that the League frequently played an active role in arbitration between its members, it seems that the League was

2. See Mitsos, p. 217. In **71** there were six judges from Knidos.

3. Peek, *MDAI(A)* 59, p. 50. For examples of joint tribunals, cf. **109**, **154**.

4. Cf., for example, the inscription cited in **156**, which states simply that the final decision will uphold the judgement of Flamininus. In any case, if a case is appealed, that fact is usually recorded, even if only briefly: cf. **31**, **38**, **129**. Within the present inscription itself there is a reference to an earlier judgement that is to remain in force (lines 22–23, 41–42). The term ἐπιχρίνω (lines 1, 24) may also imply some kind of secondary judgement (cf. **13**, **138**).

5. Bravo (pp. 866–67) and Jameson (p. 160) apparently see this as the work of two commissions but fail to specify whether they see this work as proceeding simultaneously or consecutively. Cf. Mitsos, p. 217.

6. On the κοινὴ χώρα, cf. **30**, **40**, **56**, **138**, and Daverio Rocchi, pp. 39–40. Cf. these cases as well for ἐπινομή (right of pasturage) and καρπεία. See Bravo, pp. 866–67.

not involved in this case. At any rate we hear nothing of it. If Kleitor was a member of the League at this time, as seems probable, and if the Milesians were there on League authority performing another arbitration, it could simply be that the Milesians were rather informally requested by the League, or by the two cities, to settle the Epidauros-Hermione dispute while they were there.[7]

64. Karpathos (?) mediates between two unknown states (third or second century)

A fragmented inscription found at Tristomo (Porthmos) on the island of Karpathos, dated stylistically to the end of the third or beginning of the second century. H: 0.49 m; w: 0.39 m.

M. Beaudouin, *BCH* 4 (1880) pp. 264–66, no. 2; Sonne, pp. 14–15, no. 21; Berard 44; E. Manolakakis, Καρπαθιακά (Athens, 1896) pp. 57–59, no. 11; *SGDI* 4319; *Hiller von Gaertringen, *IG* XII.1.1031.

Sonne, p. 70, no. 118; Raeder 45; Tod 82; Steinwenter, p. 179.

[- πρεc]-
[β]ευτ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
. . . . . έων π . . . . . αμενο- - - - - - - -
[ἄ]νδρας καὶ τοὺc [ἐ]πιδαμεῦντας.
[ἐκ]κατέρας τᾶν πολίων παρ[α]καλουμένας [με]-
[cιτ]ε[ῦ]cαι, ν[ομ]ογραφίαν [δ]ὲ? ποιήcacθ[αι] ἐξᾶ[c]
[εἰ]c τ[ὸ]ν ἀεὶ χρόνον παρ . . . . . ἀπε[ι]θε- - -
[ε]ἰc [τ]ὰ ἄλλα, μεc[ι]τεύοντος τοῦ δάμο[υ ἁμῶν]
[cυλλύ]ειν αὐτοὺc ἐφ' ὁμολογουμένοις, [προθύ]-
[μ]ως δὲ ἐπακούcαντες τοῖc ὑπ' ἁμῶ[ν παραι]-
[ν]ουμένοις cυνελύθηcαν ἐπὶ τ[οῖc εἰρημένοις?· ἁ δὲ]
[c]ύλλυcιc ἅδε ἀναγραφηc[εῖ] ἐ[ν τῶι ἱερῶι τοῦ]
[Π]οcειδᾶνοc τοῦ Πορθμίου - - - -

5: ἔξα[ν]: *SGDI*. ἐξ ἄc: Berard. || 5–6: ἐξ ἀ[ρχᾶc| εἰ]c τὸν ἀεὶ χρόνον παρά[μον]ον: Kaibel *ap.* Hiller von Gaertringen. || 6: χρόνον παράcαμον: Beaudouin, Sonne, Berard, *SGDI*. || 6–7: ἀπε[ι]θέ[οντας δ]⟨ὲ⟩| [ε]ἰc [τ]ὰ ἄλλα: Wilamowitz *ap.* Sonne, Berard. || 10: cυνελύθηcαν: Beaudouin, Sonne, Berard, *SGDI*. Manolakakis and Hiller von Gaertringen have cυνεληλύθεcαν; the facsimiles read ΣΥΝΕΛΥΘΗΣΑΝ.|| 10–11: ἐπὶ τ[ούτοις ὅπως ἁ| c]ύλλυcιc: Sonne, Berard. ||

7. See Wilhelm, Raeder, Guarducci, Moretti. This hypothesis would mean that there would have been no necessity for a separate League embassy to Miletos for the sake of this particular dispute. See J. A. O. Larsen, *CPh* 66 (1971) pp. 81–86. Milesian judges were in Aitolia as well c. 200, judging internal disputes in Stratos (*IG* IX^2 1.417).

not involved in this case. At any rate we hear nothing of it. If Kleitor was a member of the League at this time, as seems probable, and if the Milesians were there on League authority performing another arbitration, it could simply be that the Milesians were rather informally requested by the League, or by the two cities, to settle the Epidauros-Hermione dispute while they were there.[7]

64. Karpathos (?) mediates between two unknown states (third or second century)

A fragmented inscription found at Tristomo (Porthmos) on the island of Karpathos, dated stylistically to the end of the third or beginning of the second century. H: 0.49 m; w: 0.39 m.

M. Beaudouin, *BCH* 4 (1880) pp. 264–66, no. 2; Sonne, pp. 14–15, no. 21; Berard 44; E. Manolakakis, Καρπαθιακά (Athens, 1896) pp. 57–59, no. 11; *SGDI* 4319; *Hiller von Gaertringen, *IG* XII.1.1031.

Sonne, p. 70, no. 118; Raeder 45; Tod 82; Steinwenter, p. 179.

[- πρεc]-
[β]ευτ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
. . . . . έων π . . . . . αμενο- - - - - - - -
[ἄ]νδρας καὶ τοὺc [ἐ]πιδαμεῦντας.
[ἐκ]κατέρας τᾶν πολίων παρ[α]καλουμένας [με]-
[cιτ]ε[ῦ]cαι, ν[ομ]ογραφίαν [δ]ὲ? ποιήcacθ[αι] ἐξᾶ[c]
[εἰ]c τ[ὸ]ν ἀεὶ χρόνον παρ . . . . . ἀπε[ι]θε- - -
[ε]ἰc [τ]ὰ ἄλλα, μεc[ι]τεύοντος τοῦ δάμο[υ ἁμῶν]
[cυλλύ]ειν αὐτοὺc ἐφ' ὁμολογουμένοις, [προθύ]-
[μ]ως δὲ ἐπακούcαντες τοῖc ὑπ' ἁμῶ[ν παραι]-
[ν]ουμένοις cυνελύθηcαν ἐπὶ τ[οῖc εἰρημένοις?· ἁ δὲ]
[c]ύλλυcιc ἅδε ἀναγραφηc[εῖ] ἐ[ν τῶι ἱερῶι τοῦ]
[Π]οcειδᾶνοc τοῦ Πορθμίου - - - -

5: ἔξα[ν]: *SGDI*. ἐξ ἄc: Berard. || 5–6: ἐξ ἀ[ρχᾶc| εἰ]c τὸν ἀεὶ χρόνον παρά[μον]ον: Kaibel *ap.* Hiller von Gaertringen. || 6: χρόνον παράcαμον: Beaudouin, Sonne, Berard, *SGDI*. || 6–7: ἀπε[ι]θέ[οντας δ]⟨ὲ⟩| [ε]ἰc [τ]ὰ ἄλλα: Wilamowitz *ap.* Sonne, Berard. || 10: cυνελύθηcαν: Beaudouin, Sonne, Berard, *SGDI*. Manolakakis and Hiller von Gaertringen have cυνεληλύθεcαν; the facsimiles read ΣΥΝΕΛΥΘΗΣΑΝ.|| 10–11: ἐπὶ τ[ούτοις ὅπως ἁ| c]ύλλυcιc: Sonne, Berard. ||

7. See Wilhelm, Raeder, Guarducci, Moretti. This hypothesis would mean that there would have been no necessity for a separate League embassy to Miletos for the sake of this particular dispute. See J. A. O. Larsen, *CPh* 66 (1971) pp. 81–86. Milesian judges were in Aitolia as well c. 200, judging internal disputes in Stratos (*IG* IX^2 1.417).

13: . . . ἱερὰ κατα . . .: Beaudouin. || 14–15: - -όμενα- - -|-ν ⟨τ⟩ᾶι το[ῦ - -]: *SGDI*.

Very little can be gleaned from this inscription beyond the fact that it dealt with an arbitration or mediation, apparently international in character (line 4: ἑκατέρας τᾶν πολίων; line 7: μεσιτεύοντος τοῦ δάμου).[1] The settlement of differences between the two states was the object of the arbitration; perhaps the codification of a legal system was in question (line 5: ν[ομ]ογραφίαν).[2] In the end, though, it may not have gone to formal sentencing, as a conciliation (σύλλυσις) apparently took place.[3] This settlement was effected by the whole people of the mediating state, or by a court representative of the people, not by select judges. As in numerous other cases of arbitration, the decision of the arbitrating city was published at a sanctuary, this time the temple of Poseidon Porthmios. We do not know whether the dispute and its resolution were restricted to the states of the island of Karpathos, or whether the reference to "the people" as arbitrator was a reference to the population of the whole island settling a dispute between foreign states. Since the sanctuary of Poseidon was in the territory of Brykos, Raeder argued that the city of Brykos may have been involved as arbitrator or as disputant.

65. Dispute between Angeiai and Ktimenai, arbitrated by Thaumakoi (?) (late third or early second century)

Two fragments of a marble block discovered near the ruins of Thaumakoi in Thessaly. The block bears an inscription on the front (A) and on the right-hand side (B). H: 0.60 m; w: 0.26 m; d: 0.25 m.

*A. S. Arvanitopoulos, *RPh* 35 (1911) pp. 289–93, nos. 41 (A), 41a (B).

Tod 39; L. Robert, *BCH* 50 (1926) p. 480 n. 2; A. S. McDevitt, *Inscriptions from Thessaly* (Hildesheim, 1970) 152.

A [Φασί δ' οἱ Κτιμεναῖο]ι χρόνοις ὕστερον ἀπο[δοῦ]-
[ναι αὐτοῖς - τὴ]ν ἐξ ἀρχῆς πολιτεία[ν, ἐ]-
[πειδ]ὴ μνείαν ἐπεποίηντ[ο ἐν]-
[ταῦθα καθ]ι[ε]ρωθῆναι τὴν Ὀμφάλ[ην]

1. For the term μεσιτεύω (and related words), cf. **170**; Polyb. 11.34.3, 28.17. 8; Diod. 4.54; Piccirilli 7.

2. See Sonne 118, p. 70.

3. On the term σύλλυσις/συλλύω, cf. **63**, **74**, **83**, **105**, **109**, **135**, **137**, **158**. Here, as in some other arbitration decrees, the willingness of the litigant parties to submit to arbitration is stressed. Cf. **54** (ἐπιχωρησάντων ἐξ ὁμολόγων), **135** ([ἀμφοτ]έ[ρ]ων ἐπιτρε[ψάντων]), **160** (ἑκατέρων θελόν[τ]ων).

13: . . . ἱερὰ κατα . . .: Beaudouin. || 14–15: - -όμενα- - -|-ν ⟨τ⟩ᾶι το[ῦ - -]: *SGDI*.

Very little can be gleaned from this inscription beyond the fact that it dealt with an arbitration or mediation, apparently international in character (line 4: ἑκατέρας τᾶν πολίων; line 7: μεσιτεύοντος τοῦ δάμου).[1] The settlement of differences between the two states was the object of the arbitration; perhaps the codification of a legal system was in question (line 5: ν[ομ]ογραφίαν).[2] In the end, though, it may not have gone to formal sentencing, as a conciliation (σύλλυσις) apparently took place.[3] This settlement was effected by the whole people of the mediating state, or by a court representative of the people, not by select judges. As in numerous other cases of arbitration, the decision of the arbitrating city was published at a sanctuary, this time the temple of Poseidon Porthmios. We do not know whether the dispute and its resolution were restricted to the states of the island of Karpathos, or whether the reference to "the people" as arbitrator was a reference to the population of the whole island settling a dispute between foreign states. Since the sanctuary of Poseidon was in the territory of Brykos, Raeder argued that the city of Brykos may have been involved as arbitrator or as disputant.

65. Dispute between Angeiai and Ktimenai, arbitrated by Thaumakoi (?) (late third or early second century)

Two fragments of a marble block discovered near the ruins of Thaumakoi in Thessaly. The block bears an inscription on the front (A) and on the right-hand side (B). H: 0.60 m; w: 0.26 m; d: 0.25 m.

*A. S. Arvanitopoulos, *RPh* 35 (1911) pp. 289–93, nos. 41 (A), 41a (B).

Tod 39; L. Robert, *BCH* 50 (1926) p. 480 n. 2; A. S. McDevitt, *Inscriptions from Thessaly* (Hildesheim, 1970) 152.

A [Φασί δ' οἱ Κτιμεναῖο]ι χρόνοις ὕστερον ἀπο[δοῦ]-
[ναι αὐτοῖς - τὴ]ν ἐξ ἀρχῆς πολιτεία[ν, ἐ]-
[πειδ]ὴ μνείαν ἐπεποίηντ[ο ἐν]-
[ταῦθα καθ]ι[ε]ρωθῆναι τὴν Ὀμφάλ[ην]

1. For the term μεσιτεύω (and related words), cf. **170**; Polyb. 11.34.3, 28.17. 8; Diod. 4.54; Piccirilli 7.

2. See Sonne 118, p. 70.

3. On the term σύλλυσις/συλλύω, cf. **63**, **74**, **83**, **105**, **109**, **135**, **137**, **158**. Here, as in some other arbitration decrees, the willingness of the litigant parties to submit to arbitration is stressed. Cf. **54** (ἐπιχωρησάντων ἐξ ὁμολόγων), **135** ([ἀμφοτ]έ[ρ]ων ἐπιτρε[ψάντων]), **160** (ἑκατέρων θελόν[τ]ων).

[. . . . . c]ύνολον οὐδ' ἐνηβήσαν[τας]
. . . . οι· καὶ τὰ μὲν τῆς Δικαίο[υ]
[γενέσθαι . . . . .]οτάτην ἐπιλαμβάνοντα,
[τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα ἀνε]ιπεῖν· ἐν τούτοις ἔκειτο.
[μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα . . .] καὶ πόλεων πλειόνων
[οἰκιζομένων, ἀνδρῶν] τε ἀπὸ τῆς ξένης ἰδίω[ν]
[. . . . . λη]μμάτων καὶ τῆς νομῆς
[αὐτοῖς] παρετίθετό τε καὶ πρα-
[ξάμενος τὴν ὑ]π' Ἀνγειατῶν γεγονυῖαν
. . . . . ώμεναι τοὺς Κτιμεναί-
[ους . . . . . .]ειχῆς χώρας καὶ διορί[ζον]-
[τας τοὺς ἄλ]λους ὅρια [δι]ασυνι[δ]όν-
[τας, αὐτοὶ οὐ βου]λόμενοι τοὺς παρὰ τὸ[ν]
[ποταμὸν Ἀπιδα]νόν ἡγμένους βαρύ-
[νειν . . . . καὶ κυρι]εύοντας τῶν πρώτων [βα]-
[σιλέων . . . . . εἰ δ]ὲ μή, καθηκόντως ἐμ-
[μέ]νειν ἐπὶ τῶν ἰδίων.
[ταῦτ' οὖν συνιδόντες τ]ῆς χώρας κρίνομεν
[κυρίους εἶναι Κτιμεν]αίους.

B [τούτους] δὲ ἐ[πὶ . . .]
[τῆς πόλ]ε[ω]ς [ὑπὸ τῶν . . . τοῦ]
[δ]ήμου.
[οἰ]δ[ι]πυ[ο . . . . . τῶν Ἀγγειατ]-
ῶν δη[λούντων . . . τῷ]
[Ἀ]πόλλ[ωνι . . . . . χρης]-
μ[ό]ν [ἰ-ὑπ' αὐτοῦ . . . . . διὰ Ἀριστα]-
[γ]όρου [ἐ . . . φασὶ δὲ]
Ἀγγε[ιᾶται αὐτοὶ τὴν Ὁμ]-
φάλη[ν καθιερῶσαι πρό]-
τεροι [ἀνειπόντος τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ]
ἐν ταῖς [ἰδίαις ἑαυτῶν . . . μηδὲν ἐλλεί]-
πο[ντ]ες δο[ῦναι . . . .]
παρὰ δημ[οτῶν . . . τὴν τῶν . .]
βίων ἀσφά[λειαν . . . οὐ δ]-
[ι]καίως τὴν χώραν ἐλθεῖν ἐπὶ τὴ-
[ν] ἐπίκρισιν· δ[ιορίζουσι δὲ καὶ τὸν Ἀπιδ]-
[α]νὸν εἰς αὐ[τοὺς . . τοὺς Ἡρακλει]-
ώτας μηδ[ὲ . . . τ]ὴ[ν χώραν κο]-
. πτόντω[ν μηδὲ τοῖς] δημ[όταις . . . . ταῖς]
[πό]λεσιν τὸ δ[ια]φέρον ἡ[γούμενοι . . .]
. . ον οντο . . . δὴ τοὺς Κ[τιμεναίους πιθ]-
[α]νωτέρο[υς] διὰ τὸ περι[χαράξαι· τὴν οὖν]
διάκρισιν ταῖς διαμ[φισβητούσαις]
πόλεσι[ν] οὐ παρ[έχομεν.]

A 6: δικαιο[λογίας] or δικαιο[νομίας] or δικαιο[δοσίας]: Robert. || A 11: [θρε]μμάτων: Robert.

This inscription records the rival claims of Angeiai and Ktimenai, two neighbouring Thessalian communities, to a piece of land that must have been on their mutual border. There is no indication of the identity of the judges, except for the provenance of the inscription; they may have been from Thaumakoi.[1] The inscription is too fragmented for us to make much of it, but at least part of the controversy seems to have centred around the jurisdiction of a local cult of Omphale, which may have been located in the disputed territory. The first fragment records the claims of Ktimenai, the second the claims of Angeiai. Both states may have attempted to establish the priority of their claim to the original consecration of the cult.[2] It appears that the Ktimenaians were successful in their suit, if the editor's restoration of A, lines 22–23, is correct. Arvanitopoulos thought that in their decision the judges had recourse to an ἀναγραφή of the "ancient kings" (A, lines 19–20) and to the foundings of the cities, but it is unclear exactly what this means. He also thought that there might have been a previous (unsuccessful) attempt at arbitration in this case, but this conjecture is quite uncertain.[3]

66. An Apollonian mediates between Kallatis and an enemy (third or second century?)

An inscription found at Kallatis. H: 0.6 m; w: 0.33 m; d: 0.11 m.

*C. Jirecek, *AEM* 10 (1887) pp. 197f. (lines 1–10); **SGDI* 3089 (lines 11–40).

Sonne 37; Raeder 75; Tod 77; L. Robert, *RPh* 1939, p. 152; id., *REG* 1939, 233; id., *REG* 1964, 287; *SEG* XXIV.1024.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -ε- - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - - - - -οcαμω- - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - - - -αν καὶ ἐκ τ[ῶν - -]
- - - - - - - - - - - -να τοῦ δά[μου - - - -]
5 - - - - - - - - - - -ωρημένων - - - - - -
[- - - - - - - cωτηρί]αν ὑπερτιθέμ[ενος τῶν]
[- - - - ἰδίων - - οὔ]τε κακοπαθίαν [οὔτε κίν]-

1. Arvanitopoulos points out (p. 292) that Thaumakoi, as an important local centre, would be a natural choice for arbitrator; this is true, but its local importance also makes it a natural choice for publication of the award.

2. Cf. the claims of Angeiai, B, lines 8–12; and see Arvanitopoulos, p. 293.

3. B, lines 23–25: [τὴν οὖν]|| διάκριcιν ταῖc διαμ[φιcβητούcαιc]|| πόλεcι[ν] οὐ παρ[έχομεν.] See Arvanitopoulos, p. 292; Tod 39.

A 6: δικαιο[λογίας] or δικαιο[νομίας] or δικαιο[δοσίας]: Robert. || A 11: [θρε]μμάτων: Robert.

This inscription records the rival claims of Angeiai and Ktimenai, two neighbouring Thessalian communities, to a piece of land that must have been on their mutual border. There is no indication of the identity of the judges, except for the provenance of the inscription; they may have been from Thaumakoi.[1] The inscription is too fragmented for us to make much of it, but at least part of the controversy seems to have centred around the jurisdiction of a local cult of Omphale, which may have been located in the disputed territory. The first fragment records the claims of Ktimenai, the second the claims of Angeiai. Both states may have attempted to establish the priority of their claim to the original consecration of the cult.[2] It appears that the Ktimenaians were successful in their suit, if the editor's restoration of A, lines 22–23, is correct. Arvanitopoulos thought that in their decision the judges had recourse to an ἀναγραφή of the "ancient kings" (A, lines 19–20) and to the foundings of the cities, but it is unclear exactly what this means. He also thought that there might have been a previous (unsuccessful) attempt at arbitration in this case, but this conjecture is quite uncertain.[3]

66. An Apollonian mediates between Kallatis and an enemy (third or second century?)

An inscription found at Kallatis. H: 0.6 m; w: 0.33 m; d: 0.11 m.

*C. Jirecek, *AEM* 10 (1887) pp. 197f. (lines 1–10); **SGDI* 3089 (lines 11–40).

Sonne 37; Raeder 75; Tod 77; L. Robert, *RPh* 1939, p. 152; id., *REG* 1939, 233; id., *REG* 1964, 287; *SEG* XXIV.1024.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -ε- - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - - - - -οcαμω- - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - - - -αν καὶ ἐκ τ[ῶν - -]
- - - - - - - - - - - -να τοῦ δά[μου - - - -]
5 - - - - - - - - - - -ωρημένων - - - - - -
[- - - - - - - cωτηρί]αν ὑπερτιθέμ[ενος τῶν]
[- - - - ἰδίων - - οὔ]τε κακοπαθίαν [οὔτε κίν]-

1. Arvanitopoulos points out (p. 292) that Thaumakoi, as an important local centre, would be a natural choice for arbitrator; this is true, but its local importance also makes it a natural choice for publication of the award.

2. Cf. the claims of Angeiai, B, lines 8–12; and see Arvanitopoulos, p. 293.

3. B, lines 23–25: [τὴν οὖν]|| διάκριcιν ταῖc διαμ[φιcβητούcαιc]|| πόλεcι[ν] οὐ παρ[έχομεν.] See Arvanitopoulos, p. 292; Tod 39.

[δυνον ἐκκλίνων - - τ]ῶι δάμωι τι τῶν ποτὶ - -
[- - - - - - π]ό[λιν - -]ονῆσαι τοῦ τε βας[ιλέως]
- - - - - - - ἀξι[ωθ]έντος ὑπὸ Ἀcαβιθ- - - -
- - - - -ιων ὅπως λύcη τὸν ποτὶ C- - - - -
- - - - ἐνεcτακότα πόλεμον ἐξαπ[οcτ]-
[αλεὶ]c ἐκτενῶc καὶ προθύμωc καὶ με[τὰ]
[παρ]ρηcίαc ἐχρημάτιξεν περὶ τῶν [τᾶc]
[π]όλιοc δικαίων· ὅπως οὖν καὶ ὁ δᾶ[μοc]
[φ]αίνηται τοὺc εὐνοοῦντας ἑαυτῶι κα-
[λ]ο[ὺc] καὶ ἀγαθοὺc ἄνδραc τιμῶν καθηκ[ό]-
ν[τ]ωc, ἐπαινείcθαι μὲν ἐπὶ τούτοιc τόν τε [δᾶ]-
μον τὸν Ἀπ[ο]λλωνιατᾶν, ἔχοντα τὸν προ[θύ]-
μωc ἀντιλαμβανόμενον τᾶc Καλλατ[ια]-
νῶν cωτηρίαc, καὶ Cτρατώνακτα Λυγ[δά]-
μιοc, δεδόχθαι τᾶι βουλᾶι καὶ τῶι δάμ[ωι,]
[ἐ]παγγείλαcθαι αὐτῶι, ὅτι ὁ δᾶμοc ἀπ[οκα]-
[τ]αcταθέντων αὐτῶι τῶν πραγμάτ[ων]
[ε]ἰc τὰν ἐξ ἀρχᾶc διάθεcιν καὶ τηροῦν[τοc]
[α]ἰτοῦ τὰν αἵρεcιν, ἂν ἔχων διατελεῖ [πρὸc]
[τ]ὰ κοινά, ἀξίωc αὐτο⟨ῦ⟩ ἐπιcτραφηcε[ίται]
[τ]ῶν γεγονότων εἰc αὐτὸν εὐεργε[τημά]-
[τω]ν· ἀποcτείλαι δὲ τοὺc cτρατα[γοὺc τὸ]
[ἀ]ντίγραφον τοῖc Ἀπολλωνιατᾶν ἄ[ρχουcιν]
[κ]αὶ παρακαλέcαι αὐτοὺc τὸν ἔπαιν[ον ἀνα]-
[θέ]μεν εἰc τὸ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνοc ἱερ[όν, τό]-
[π]ον ἐπιτάδειον ἐκλεξαμένο[υc, καλέ]-
[c]αι δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ τὸν βαcιλέα ε[ἰc τὸ πρυ]-
[τ]ανεῖον· τοὺc δὲ προβούλουc [τοὺc προ]-
[βου]λεύοντας τὸν μῆνα τὸν - - - -
[ἀπ]οδείξαι τόπον ἐν τ[ᾶι ἀγορᾶι]
[εἰc] δν ἀνατεθηcείται - - - - -
[ὁ τ]ε[λα]μών - - - - - - -
- - - - - -ΠΟΤΕ- - - - -

27: αὐτὸν ἐπιστραφήσε[cθαι]: Jirecek. || 31–32: τὸν ἔπαι[νον| θέ]μεν: Jirecek. || 40: [τὸ δὲ ἀνάλωμα ὑ]ποτε[λέσαι τὸν ταμίαν]: Robert.

This inscription is a decree of the polis of Kallatis, situated on the shore of the Black Sea near the mouth of the Danube. In it the people of Kallatis express their gratitude to the people of Apollonia, which should no doubt be identified with Thracian Apollonia on the Black Sea. The Apollonians had dispatched one of their citizens, a certain Stratonax, to act as an arbitrator or mediator in a war in which Kallatis was involved. The name of the enemy state is lost, although it apparently began with "S" (line 11); one of Kallatis's neighbouring states is

probably to be understood here.[1] Jirecek dated this inscription to the period after the death of Attalos III, based on its style. Woodhead, however, believed it to be earlier, and dated it to the turn of the third and second centuries.[2]

67. An agreement between Hierapytna and Priansos (early second century)

A lengthy, well-preserved inscription of a treaty from Crete. H: 1.57 m; w: 0.43 m; d: 0.20 m. Only the relevant portions of the treaty are cited here.

Böckh, *CIG* 2556; Hicks 172; Cauer[2] 119; Michel 16; Blass, *SGDI* 5040; *Guarducci, *IC* III.iii, pp. 43–49, no. 4 (q.v. for the earliest epigraphic transcriptions).

Sonne 56; Berard 47; A. Scrinzi, *AIV* ser. 7, 9 (1897–98) pp. 1564f.; Hitzig 46, pp. 51–53; Maiuri, *RAL* 1910, pp. 40f.; Phillipson, p. 136; Raeder 76; Tod 54; B. Haussoullier, *Traité entre Delphes et Pellana* (Paris, 1917) pp. 81–85; A. Wilhelm, *SAWW* 183 (1924) Abh. III, 18; Muttelsee, pp. 54f., 68f.; M. van der Mijnsbrugge, *The Cretan Koinon* (New York, 1931) pp. 38f., 78f.; M. Guarducci, *Epigraphica* II (1940) pp. 149–66; Robert, *REG* 1942, 142; van Effenterre, pp. 141f.; M. Guarducci, *RFC* 78 (1950) pp. 148–54; R. Willetts, *Aristocratic Society in Ancient Crete* (London, 1955) pp. 143–44; Gauthier, pp. 316–24, 328, 365; Gawantka, pp. 49, 83, 217; H. Müller, *Chiron* 5 (1975) p. 143; J. Vélissaropoulos, *RD* 53 (1975) pp. 36–47; id., *Les nauclères grecs* (Paris, 1980) pp. 175, 177, 210; Gruen, pp. 88, 110; Ager, *JHS* 114 (1994) pp. 1–18.

αἰ δέ τις ἀδικοίη
τὰ cυνκείμενα κοινᾶι διαλύων ἢ κόcμος ἢ ἰδιώτας, ἐ-
ξέcτω τῶι βωλομένωι δικάξαcθαι ἐπὶ τῶ κοινῶ δι-
καcτηρίω τίμαμα ἐπιγραψάμενον τᾶc δίκας κατὰ τὸ
ἀδίκημα ὅ κά τις ἀδικήcηι· καὶ εἴ κα νικάcηι, λαβέτω τὸ
τρίτον μέρος τᾶc δίκας ὁ δικαξάμενος, τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν ἔc-
τω τᾶν πόλεων.

ὑπὲρ δὲ τῶν προγεγονότων παρ' ἑκατέροις
ἀδικημάτων ἀφ' ὦ τὸ κοινοδίκιον ἀπέλιπε χρόνω, ποιη-
cάcθων τὰν διεξαγωγὰν οἱ cὺν 'Ενίπαντι καὶ Νέωνι κό[c]-
μοι ἐν ὧι κα κοινᾶι δόξηι δικαcτηρίῳ ἀμφοτέραις ταῖc πό-
λεcι ἐπ' αὐτῶν κοcμόντων καὶ τὸc ἐγγύοc καταcτacάν-
των ὑπὲρ τούτων ἀφ' ἃc κα ἁμέρας ἃ cτάλα τεθῆι ἐμ μη-

1. Earlier in the third century Kallatis had refused, evidently to its own detriment, the mediation of its metropolis Herakleia in its war with Byzantion (**34**).

2. *SEG* XXIV.1024.

probably to be understood here.[1] Jirecek dated this inscription to the period after the death of Attalos III, based on its style. Woodhead, however, believed it to be earlier, and dated it to the turn of the third and second centuries.[2]

67. An agreement between Hierapytna and Priansos (early second century)

A lengthy, well-preserved inscription of a treaty from Crete. H: 1.57 m; w: 0.43 m; d: 0.20 m. Only the relevant portions of the treaty are cited here.

Böckh, *CIG* 2556; Hicks 172; Cauer[2] 119; Michel 16; Blass, *SGDI* 5040; *Guarducci, *IC* III.iii, pp. 43–49, no. 4 (q.v. for the earliest epigraphic transcriptions).

Sonne 56; Berard 47; A. Scrinzi, *AIV* ser. 7, 9 (1897–98) pp. 1564f.; Hitzig 46, pp. 51–53; Maiuri, *RAL* 1910, pp. 40f.; Phillipson, p. 136; Raeder 76; Tod 54; B. Haussoullier, *Traité entre Delphes et Pellana* (Paris, 1917) pp. 81–85; A. Wilhelm, *SAWW* 183 (1924) Abh. III, 18; Muttelsee, pp. 54f., 68f.; M. van der Mijnsbrugge, *The Cretan Koinon* (New York, 1931) pp. 38f., 78f.; M. Guarducci, *Epigraphica* II (1940) pp. 149–66; Robert, *REG* 1942, 142; van Effenterre, pp. 141f.; M. Guarducci, *RFC* 78 (1950) pp. 148–54; R. Willetts, *Aristocratic Society in Ancient Crete* (London, 1955) pp. 143–44; Gauthier, pp. 316–24, 328, 365; Gawantka, pp. 49, 83, 217; H. Müller, *Chiron* 5 (1975) p. 143; J. Vélissaropoulos, *RD* 53 (1975) pp. 36–47; id., *Les nauclères grecs* (Paris, 1980) pp. 175, 177, 210; Gruen, pp. 88, 110; Ager, *JHS* 114 (1994) pp. 1–18.

αἰ δέ τις ἀδικοίη
τὰ cυνκείμενα κοινᾶι διαλύων ἢ κόcμος ἢ ἰδιώτας, ἐ-
ξέcτω τῶι βωλομένωι δικάξαcθαι ἐπὶ τῶ κοινῶ δι-
καcτηρίω τίμαμα ἐπιγραψάμενον τᾶc δίκας κατὰ τὸ
ἀδίκημα ὅ κά τις ἀδικήcηι· καὶ εἴ κα νικάcηι, λαβέτω τὸ
τρίτον μέρος τᾶc δίκας ὁ δικαξάμενος, τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν ἔc-
τω τᾶν πόλεων.

ὑπὲρ δὲ τῶν προγεγονότων παρ' ἑκατέροις
ἀδικημάτων ἀφ' ὦ τὸ κοινοδίκιον ἀπέλιπε χρόνω, ποιη-
cάcθων τὰν διεξαγωγὰν οἱ cὺν 'Ενίπαντι καὶ Νέωνι κό[c]-
μοι ἐν ὧι κα κοινᾶι δόξηι δικαcτηρίῳ ἀμφοτέραις ταῖc πό-
λεcι ἐπ' αὐτῶν κοcμόντων καὶ τὸc ἐγγύοc καταcτacάν-
των ὑπὲρ τούτων ἀφ' ἃc κα ἁμέρας ἃ cτάλα τεθῆι ἐμ μη-

1. Earlier in the third century Kallatis had refused, evidently to its own detriment, the mediation of its metropolis Herakleia in its war with Byzantion (**34**).

2. *SEG* XXIV.1024.

νί. ὑπὲρ δὲ τῶν ὕστερον ἐγγινομένων ἀδικημάτων προ-
δίκωι μὲν χρήσθων καθὼς τὸ διάγραμμα ἔχει· περὶ δὲ τῶ
δικαστηρίω οἱ ἐπιστάμενοι κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν παρ' ἑκατέροις
κόσμοι πόλιν στανυέσθων ἄγ κα ἀμφοτέραις ταῖς πόλες[ι]
[δό]ξηι ἐξ ἃς τὸ ἐπικριτήριον τέλεται, καὶ ἐγγύος καθιστάν-
των ἀφ' ἃς κα ἀμέρας ἐπιστᾶντι ἐπὶ τὸ ἀρχεῖον ἐν διμήνωι,
καὶ διεξαγόντων ταῦτα ἐπ' αὐτῶν κοσμόντων κατὰ τὸ
δοχθὲν κοινᾶι σύμβολον. αἰ δέ κα μὴ ποιήσωντι οἱ κόσμοι κα-
θὼς γέγραπται, ἀποτεισάτω ἕκαστος αὐτῶν στατῆρας
πεντήκοντα, οἱ μὲν Ἱεραπύτνιοι κόσμοι Πριανσίων τᾶι πόλει,
οἱ δὲ Πριάνσιοι κόσμοι Ἱεραπυτνίων τᾶι πόλει.

47: εἰ: Böckh, Hicks, Cauer, Michel, Blass. || 50: ἐπιγραψάμενος: Böckh (after Price), Cauer, Michel. || 52: ⟨κατα⟩δίκας: Böckh, Hicks. || 68: τελε⟨ῖ⟩ται: Böckh, Hicks, Michel.

This inscription records the terms of an isopolity between the south Cretan cities of Hierapytna and Priansos.[1] Regulations governing the legal relationships between the cities in the case of any dispute were part of this agreement. There has always been controversy over whether these regulations refer to the contingency of an "international" dispute between the two communities or whether they were meant to deal with suits between individual citizens of the two states. Tod believed that the treaty referred primarily to disputes between citizens, but also that it covered the possibility of international disagreements between the states. Raeder also believed that it covered both contingencies; he thought that the κοινοδίκιον (line 59) would have dealt with intercity disputes both private and public. Guarducci argued that the first passage (lines 47–53) dealt with the only public crimes to be mentioned in the treaty, while the second passage was concerned with private disputes. Both Hitzig and Gauthier maintained that the preponderant role of the *kosmoi* should lead us to believe that the disputes foreseen were public ones, and that the *kosmoi* were to be representatives of their cities.

The first passage cited here is the most straightforward. It deals specifically with any attempt to contravene the terms of the agreement, a not uncommon provision in international treaties, including arbitration treaties.[2] The security provisions in the agreement between Hierapytna and Priansos were to extend both to private individuals and to the *kosmoi*. Here at least it seems clear that possible *public* contraventions of the treaty were envisioned, and that one state might arraign the other through its *kosmos*. If the suit against the accused, brought before the κοινὸν δικαστήριον, was successful, then the accuser was to receive a third of the penalty assessed, and the remainder was to go "to the cities,"

1. Cf. the document discussed in **6** Appendix.
2. Cf. **14**, **47**, **48**, **71**, **109**.

that is, to the injured city. The passage fails to specify the nature of this κοινὸν δικαστήριον; it could have been a joint court drawn from representatives of both Hierapytna and Priansos, a practice common enough in interstate judicial affairs. On the other hand, while such a tribunal might be suitable for the trial of suits against individual citizens, it seems less so in the event of accusations laid against a *kosmos*. Perhaps there was some degree of participation from a neutral third party. This seems to be the case with the δικαστήριον mentioned later in the treaty.[3]

It is in the second passage, which begins with a discussion of the settlement of outstanding litigation (lines 58–63), that we find a reference to the institution called the κοινοδίκιον.[4] This institution clearly had some jurisdiction over disputes between communities, since it is just such disputes that have apparently gone unjudged between Hierapytna and Priansos since the dissolution of the κοινοδίκιον. But what precisely the κοινοδίκιον itself was has been a matter of some debate. Some have argued that it was a federal tribunal of the Cretan *koinon*, a tribunal convened to deal with interstate disputes that would disrupt that body.[5] But there is no firm evidence for such a view, and comparison with other appearances of the name suggests it is better to think of a mixed court (in this case, of Hierapytnians and Priansians) judging the mutual offenses of their citizens.[6] At any rate, whatever the κοινοδίκιον was, it was no longer functioning at the time of the treaty between Hierapytna and Priansos, and it became the responsibility of the *kosmoi* of the two cities to settle the outstanding disputes. They were to convene a tribunal agreed upon jointly by the two cities and carry through the hearing of the cases within the year they were in office. The *kosmoi* were to furnish financial securities to ensure the execution of these duties; the fact that they, rather than private individuals, were required to deposit a security led Hitzig to believe that these were public, not private, cases.

The method of dealing with future disputes arising after the signing of this treaty, although laid out in detail (lines 64f.), is far from clear. It seems to have been a two-stage process, whereby a dispute was first of all to be submitted to an arbitrator for conciliation (προδίκωι μὲν χρήϲθων).[7] The appearance of the substantive without the article implies that no particular office or specific individual was envisioned as permanently acting in this capacity; rather, the arbitrator might be anyone who could be called upon when the occasion arose.

3. Line 66; see below.

4. For a complete discussion of the very few references to Cretan and non-Cretan κοινοδίκια, see Ager, *JHS* 114. Cf. **110**.

5. Guarducci, *IC* III, p. 49; Gauthier, p. 323.

6. See van Effenterre, p. 148; and Ager, *JHS* 114. For a convoluted and untenable argument regarding the κοινοδίκιον, see van der Mijnsbrugge.

7. Although elsewhere the term πρόδικοϲ (and related words) implies advocacy rather than neutrality (**125**; Piccirilli 36), here it very clearly refers to arbitration.

Thus a dispute might go to friendly arbitration or mediation before going to formal arbitration. This use of an arbitrator was to be in accordance with the διάγραμμα. The appearance of the term in other inscriptions, employed in such a way as to imply that it was well recognized, suggests that it was an institution of general significance.[8] The most reasonable conjecture for the nature of the Cretan διάγραμμα was that it was a general code setting out certain regulations for disputes between states. The διάγραμμα may have enumerated the specific penalties for particular charges, a codification that is implied in lines 50–51.[9] Van Effenterre believed that the διάγραμμα was some such code of (financial) penalties; in his view there would generally have been a primary conciliation attempt, based on this code of pecuniary considerations and compensations.

If turning to an arbitrator in accordance with the διάγραμμα proved to be ineffective, the second stage evidently was to refer the case to the formal judgement of a third city, which would be appointed by the *kosmoi* with the approval of both sides.[10] Here, then, there is at last an unambiguous reference to formal international arbitral procedure, with the involvement of a neutral third state. But the inscription still leaves it open to question whether the tribunal provided by that state would be judging public or private disputes.

68. A treaty between unknown states, envisioning Sikinos as an arbitrator (?) (first third of the second century)

Three fragments of a stele discovered on Delos; h: 0.43 m; w (max.): 0.19 m; d: 0.07 m.

*****Roussel, *IG* XI.1063.

M. Homolle, *Archives des missions scientifiques et littéraires* 3.13 (1887) p. 420, no. 69; M.-F. Baslez/C. Vial, *BCH* 111 (1987) p. 294.

Θ ε [ο ί]
τάδε ὡμολόγηcαν οἱ π[ρεcβευταὶ οἱ]
πεμφθέντες αὐτοκρά[τορεc περὶ τῆc]
[ε]ἰρήνης Πιcτ[ο]χλῆ[c - - - - - -],

8. Cf. *IG* XII.3.254; *IC* I.xvi.1; and the documents discussed in **5** and **6** Appendix.

9. See Guarducci, *IC* III, p. 48, who compares *IC* I.xvi.1, the treaty between Gortyn and Lato: τιμαῖc δὲ χρηcιόμεθα ταῖc ἐc τῶ διαγράμματος τῶ τῶν Κρηταιέων αἳ ἑκάcτων ἔγραπται. Cf. Gauthier, p. 323.

10. For the referral of a case not settled by an arbitrator to a tribunal, Guarducci (*IC* III, p. 49) cites the Athenian model. See Böckh, p. 416; Gauthier, p. 321.

Thus a dispute might go to friendly arbitration or mediation before going to formal arbitration. This use of an arbitrator was to be in accordance with the διάγραμμα. The appearance of the term in other inscriptions, employed in such a way as to imply that it was well recognized, suggests that it was an institution of general significance.[8] The most reasonable conjecture for the nature of the Cretan διάγραμμα was that it was a general code setting out certain regulations for disputes between states. The διάγραμμα may have enumerated the specific penalties for particular charges, a codification that is implied in lines 50–51.[9] Van Effenterre believed that the διάγραμμα was some such code of (financial) penalties; in his view there would generally have been a primary conciliation attempt, based on this code of pecuniary considerations and compensations.

If turning to an arbitrator in accordance with the διάγραμμα proved to be ineffective, the second stage evidently was to refer the case to the formal judgement of a third city, which would be appointed by the *kosmoi* with the approval of both sides.[10] Here, then, there is at last an unambiguous reference to formal international arbitral procedure, with the involvement of a neutral third state. But the inscription still leaves it open to question whether the tribunal provided by that state would be judging public or private disputes.

68. A treaty between unknown states, envisioning Sikinos as an arbitrator (?) (first third of the second century)

Three fragments of a stele discovered on Delos; h: 0.43 m; w (max.): 0.19 m; d: 0.07 m.

*****Roussel, *IG* XI.1063.

M. Homolle, *Archives des missions scientifiques et littéraires* 3.13 (1887) p. 420, no. 69; M.-F. Baslez/C. Vial, *BCH* 111 (1987) p. 294.

Θ ε [ο ί]
τάδε ὡμολόγηcαν οἱ π[ρεcβευταὶ οἱ]
πεμφθέντες αὐτοκρά[τορεc περὶ τῆc]
[ε]ἰρήνης Πιcτ[ο]χλῆ[c - - - - - -],

8. Cf. *IG* XII.3.254; *IC* I.xvi.1; and the documents discussed in **5** and **6** Appendix.

9. See Guarducci, *IC* III, p. 48, who compares *IC* I.xvi.1, the treaty between Gortyn and Lato: τιμαῖc δὲ χρηcιόμεθα ταῖc ἐc τῶ διαγράμματος τῶ τῶν Κρηταιέων αἳ ἑκάcτων ἔγραπται. Cf. Gauthier, p. 323.

10. For the referral of a case not settled by an arbitrator to a tribunal, Guarducci (*IC* III, p. 49) cites the Athenian model. See Böckh, p. 416; Gauthier, p. 321.

Ἀντι[- - - - - - - - - - - - Τι]-
μουχίδα προς[- - - - - - - - - - ἔ]-
[κ]ριναν διαδίκασθαι αὐ- - - - - -
τε αἱ πόλεις κοιναὶ εἰς - - - - - -
ὡμολόγησαν τῆι πόλ[ει τῆι Σικινητῶν?]
παρεῖναι δὲ ἐξ ἀμφο[τέρων - - - - -]
νον ἐν τῶι μηνὶ τῶι - - - - - - - -
χόντων οἱ ΚΑΜΕ- - - - - - - - - -
. . . 13 . . . ν τὸ δικασ[τήριον - -]
. . . 10 . . . έντας μὴ πλέ[ον? - - -]
σαι τὸ δικαστήριον· ὅ(τ)αν [μὲν - - -]
ἠττᾶσθαι αὐτούς· ὅταν δὲ α- - - - - -
ριον οἱ Σικινῆται ἐνδι[κάζειν? ἐν τῶι πρώτωι]
[μ]ηνὶ ἢ ὧι ἂν αἰτήσωνται[ι - - - - - - - -]
- - ἃ προσέταξαν, οἱ Ι- - - - - - - - -
- - - τὰ δὲ κριθέντ[α - - - - - - - - - -]
- - - να . αν τὸ δι[καστήριον - - - - - -]

There is little left of this inscription, but what remains indicates that it contained an arbitration treaty. Certain plenipotentiary ambassadors had convened, perhaps at Delos, in order to come to an understanding on the terms of a treaty. Among those terms was an agreement to submit disputes to arbitration. Certain outstanding problems were to be settled by arbitration as part of the requirements of the peace settlement. The cities concluding the peace evidently agreed on the state of Sikinos as a suitable arbitrator of their differences. Both sides were to send representatives to Sikinos within a fixed period of time in order to represent their state before the tribunal. The last lines of the inscription apparently dealt with regulations governing the procedure of the arbitration, but they are too fragmented to give any continuous sense.

There is no way of knowing what states were involved here, beyond the fact that Sikinos was apparently the arbitrating polis.[1] The provenance of the inscription, Delos, is not particularly helpful; any important international sanctuary became a natural repository for any and all important international agreements. The original editor assigned a date of the third century to this inscription. But Baslez and Vial give it a date of the first part of the second century. If the latter conjecture is correct, then we might speculate, based on the provenance of Delos and the appearance of Sikinos, that this was an agreement among certain member states of the *koinon* of Nesiotes, under Rhodian hegemony in the second century.

1. The name of Kameiros might be thought to be preserved in line 12, but from 408/7 on the government and name of Kameiros appeared only as a local administrative unit. See Berthold, p. 41.

69. An arbitration between Kaphyai and Tegea (?) (second century)

Two fragments of a limestone slab (a and b), inscribed on both sides (A and B); discovered at Olympia. H (together): 0.29 m; w (together): 0.14 m; d: 0.093 m.

*Dittenberger/Purgold, *IOlympia* 50.

Tod 9.

Aa - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - - -αν παραχρ[ῆ]-
[μα - - - - - τὰν] τοῦ δικαστηρίου κρί-
[cιν - - - - - - - -]αcαν ῥητῶc τὰν
- - - - - - - - - -αν, οἱ μὲν τοῖc τῶν
- - - - - - - - - -αcα[ν κα]ὶ τοῖc cυνο
[- - - - - - - - ἰ]δίαι τοc[αὔτ]α? τῶ[ν]
[- - - - - - - - - τ]ὸν αὐ[τὸν?] τ . . ε .
[- - - - - - - - κ]ατὰ [τ]ὰν [κρί]cιν? η -
- - - - - - - - - -ται παρ' ὅcαc ει- - -
- - - - - - - - - - -τα λαχ- - - - - -

Ab - - - - - - - - - - - -λ- - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - ἐὰν κ- - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - - -ο ἀγα[θ . . .]χα- -
- - - - - - - - - - -λαι ἐθ . . . . ε . . . ε-
- - - - - - - - - - - - - -c[θ]η καὶ ἐξ[η]
[- - - - - - - - - - τᾶc π]όλιοc τῶν Τ-
[εγεατᾶν - - - - - - - - - το]ῦ δικαcτη-
[ρίου - - - - - - - - - - - - -]μη- - -

Ba [- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - τ]-
ᾶc [β]ουλ[ᾶc - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
[τ]ὸ γραπτὸν ε- - - - - - - - - - - - -
Καφυιέω[ν κα]ὶ ε[- - - - - - - - - κρί]-
cει, καὶ ταύ[τα]ν τ[ὰν κρίcιν - - - - - -]
τοὺc το[ῦ π]ολέ[μου - - - - - - - - - -]

Bb - - - - -οιc ε- - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - - οἱ Τεγεὰ[ται - - - - - - - - - - -]
. ων ἄρχεcθα[ι - - - - - - - - - - - -]

It was suggested in *IOlympia* that this extremely fragmented text might refer to an arbitration between the two states, Tegea and Kaphyai, whose names are preserved in it. Certain terms that appear in the text might relate to the judgement of a tribunal (δικαστήριον, κρίcιc), and there appear to be references to a war (line 24), to a civic council (line 19), and perhaps to some kind of legal document or communiqué (line 20). But there is nothing to indicate the

provenance of the judges, the nature of the dispute, or the outcome of the putative trial. In fact the only point that can be made for certain about this possible arbitration is a negative one: it would not have been over a boundary conflict if the two states mentioned in it are the disputants, since they did not have a common border. Still, there is nothing to prevent one of the states whose name has survived from having been the arbitrating state.

The original editors compared this inscription in its "neat and compact" second-century style to other arbitral documents of the Achaian League. Dittenberger cited *IOlympia* 49 as a similar document and perhaps from the same period. But both are so fragmented, particularly *IOlympia* 49, that it is impossible to make any kind of judgement about them.[1]

70. A territorial arbitration between Kondaia and an unknown state, perhaps Gonnoi (second century)

An inscription discovered at Larisa in Thessaly. H: 0.46 m; w: 0.33 m; d: 0.11 m. A small fragment once thought to be part of the same inscription (*IG* IX.2.1014) has since been shown to be unconnected (see C. Habicht, *Demetrias* I [Bonn, 1976] pp. 157–73).

G. D. Zekides, *AE* 1901, pp. 124–28, no. 1; *Kern, *IG* IX.2.521; L. Piccirilli, *ASNP* 1970, pp. 316–17; Daverio Rocchi, pp. 102–6, no. 4 (cf. **54**).

Raeder 33; Tod 43; Robert, *REG* 1939, 149; Wilhelm, *GIRI*, p. 44; Robert, *REG* 1951, 125–26; id., *REG* 1953, 100; id., *REG* 1956, 138; *SEG* XIII.392; Robert, *REG* 1958, 8; id., *REG* 1959, 223; Piccirilli, *ASNP* 1970, pp. 313–46; Robert, *REG* 1973, 241.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -χο . .
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -αρεις
[. . . ἐ]ν Λαρίς[η]ι ἀ[ν]αγεγραμμένην
[ἐν τ]ῶι ἱερῶι τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ Κε[ρ]-
[δο]ίου· καὶ Λάδικος ὁ Ἀσκυριεὺς ἐμαρ-
[τ]ύρησεν μαρτυρίαν τήνδε· μαρτ[υ]-
ρεῖ Λάδικος Ἀρμ[οδ]ίου Ἀσκυριεὺς
Κονδαιεῦσιν· ἐπ[ίς]ταμαι τὴν χώρα[ν],
[ἣ]ν καὶ παρὼν ἐνεφάνιζον τοῖς κρι-
ταῖς ἀπὸ τῆς κορυφῆς τοῦ Ν[υ]σείου
[κ]αταβαίνων τὸν ἔν[γι]ον πρὸς ἡμᾶ[ς]

1. See **36** Appendix on *IOlympia* 49. Tod listed both *IOlympia* 49 and 50 as possible cases of arbitration. That *IOlympia* 49 has been relegated to the appendix in the present collection is indicative of the fact that the surviving terminology of *IOlympia* 50 offers (marginally) more reason for its inclusion here.

provenance of the judges, the nature of the dispute, or the outcome of the putative trial. In fact the only point that can be made for certain about this possible arbitration is a negative one: it would not have been over a boundary conflict if the two states mentioned in it are the disputants, since they did not have a common border. Still, there is nothing to prevent one of the states whose name has survived from having been the arbitrating state.

The original editors compared this inscription in its "neat and compact" second-century style to other arbitral documents of the Achaian League. Dittenberger cited *IOlympia* 49 as a similar document and perhaps from the same period. But both are so fragmented, particularly *IOlympia* 49, that it is impossible to make any kind of judgement about them.[1]

70. A territorial arbitration between Kondaia and an unknown state, perhaps Gonnoi (second century)

An inscription discovered at Larisa in Thessaly. H: 0.46 m; w: 0.33 m; d: 0.11 m. A small fragment once thought to be part of the same inscription (*IG* IX.2.1014) has since been shown to be unconnected (see C. Habicht, *Demetrias* I [Bonn, 1976] pp. 157–73).

G. D. Zekides, *AE* 1901, pp. 124–28, no. 1; *Kern, *IG* IX.2.521; L. Piccirilli, *ASNP* 1970, pp. 316–17; Daverio Rocchi, pp. 102–6, no. 4 (cf. **54**).

Raeder 33; Tod 43; Robert, *REG* 1939, 149; Wilhelm, *GIRI*, p. 44; Robert, *REG* 1951, 125–26; id., *REG* 1953, 100; id., *REG* 1956, 138; *SEG* XIII.392; Robert, *REG* 1958, 8; id., *REG* 1959, 223; Piccirilli, *ASNP* 1970, pp. 313–46; Robert, *REG* 1973, 241.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -χο . .
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -αρεις
[. . . ἐ]ν Λαρίς[η]ι ἀ[ν]αγεγραμμένην
[ἐν τ]ῶι ἱερῶι τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ Κε[ρ]-
[δο]ίου· καὶ Λάδικος ὁ Ἀσκυριεὺς ἐμαρ-
[τ]ύρησεν μαρτυρίαν τήνδε· μαρτ[υ]-
ρεῖ Λάδικος Ἀρμ[οδ]ίου Ἀσκυριεὺς
Κονδαιεῦσιν· ἐπ[ίς]ταμαι τὴν χώρα[ν],
[ἣ]ν καὶ παρὼν ἐνεφάνιζον τοῖς κρι-
ταῖς ἀπὸ τῆς κορυφῆς τοῦ Ν[υ]σείου
[κ]αταβαίνων τὸν ἔν[γι]ον πρὸς ἡμᾶ[ς]

1. See **36** Appendix on *IOlympia* 49. Tod listed both *IOlympia* 49 and 50 as possible cases of arbitration. That *IOlympia* 49 has been relegated to the appendix in the present collection is indicative of the fact that the surviving terminology of *IOlympia* 50 offers (marginally) more reason for its inclusion here.

[τ]όπον ἄχρι τῆ[ς] φάραγγος, ἥς καὶ Κον[δαι]-
εῖς ἐπεδείκ[ν]υον τοῖς κριταῖς, κ[αὶ]
τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἤκουον πρόσχο[ρεῖν]
[Κ]ονδαιεῦσι κατὰ το[ῦ]τον τὸν τόπον κ[αὶ αὐ]-
τὸς ἐπίσταμαι νομεύων ἐν τῆι χώρα[ι]
πλείω χρόνον καὶ [Κ]ονδαιεῖς τηροῦντα[ς]
τὸ παραγώγιον ἐν τούτωι τῶι τόπω[ι·]
παρείχοντο δὲ καὶ Μοψειατῶν μα[ρ]-
τυρίας εἰς τὴν κάτω χώραν ἣν ἐμ[αρ]-
τύρησεν . ανταιος Κλεοβούλου [Μο]-
ψειάτη[ς - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
νοχορίου νι . . ο . . . . ς . [Κ]ον[δαι]-
[ε]ῦσιν διὰ τοῦ ποταμοῦ ἀρξάμενο[ς ἀ]-
[π]ὸ τῶν συνβολῶν τοῦ Πηνειοῦ καὶ το[ῦ]
[Ε]ὐρωποῦ ἄχρι τῆς κελέτρας καὶ τῆ[ς]
φάρανγος τῆς ἀπ' Ὀρχείου ἀγούσης, κα[ὶ]
οἶδα γεωργοῦντας [Κ]ονδαεῖς καὶ νεμο-
μένους τὰ περὶ τὸν πύργον τὸν ὑποκ[ά]-
τω τῆ{ι}ς Μινύης. ἐμαρτύρησεν δὲ κ[αὶ]
Θεόδωρος Βραχύλλου, Σωκράτης Σιμ-
[μί]α, Αἴχμων Φιλοξενίδου Μοψει(εῖ)ς Κονδ[αι]-
[εῦ]σιν οἱ τὴν κελέτραν κεκτημένοι τὴν [ὑ]-
[π]οκάτω τῆς Κρο[κ]ειάδος πλησιόχορ[ον]
[εἶνα]ι τὴν κελέτραν τὴν αὐτῶν τῆι κε[λέ]-
[τραι τῆι] τῶν Κονδαιέων τῆι ὑποκάτω
[τῆς Κροκειάδ]ος. παρ[έσχο]ντο δὲ Κο[νδαι]-
- - - - - - - - - - - - -εδ . . Κον[δαιε- -]

7: Ἀρμ[ον]ίου: Zekides. || 10: Ν[υ]σσίο[υ]: Zekides. || 11: τὸν [βατ]όν: Zekides. τὸν ἔν[γι]ον: Wilamowitz. || 14: πρόσχο[ρον]: Zekides. || 15–16: κ[αὶ αὐ]|τὸς ἐπίσταμαι: Zekides, Wilhelm. κ[αὶ μό]|νος ἐπίσταμαι: Kern. || 21: Ἀντ[α]ῖος: Zekides. || 22–23: [πλη|σ]ιοχορίο: Zekides. || 34: τῆς Κρο[ν]ειάδος: Zekides.

This dispute arose from a dispute over claims to a particular piece of land, as so often occurred. But this inscription differs from many others in that it contains a record of the actual testimony given by several witnesses.[1] This testimony is given in the first person and, in all likelihood, represents a fairly faithful copy of what was actually said. The full inscription, then, unlike many others that only briefly record cases of arbitration, no doubt gave a detailed picture of the trial procedure, evidence of witnesses, decision of the judges, and delineation of the boundaries. Unfortunately, all that remains is the evidence given in favour of Kondaia. The inscription was set up at Larisa in the temple of Apollo. The arbitrators may have been from Larisa, but a temple of Apollo at Larisa could

1. Cf. 54.

simply have provided a suitable place to publish a settlement of a land dispute among Thessalian communities nearby.[2]

A shepherd named Ladikos, from Askyris, is the first witness named in the inscription to give his evidence (lines 5–18). He establishes his claim to be an "expert" witness: he knows from his elders that the Kondaians had a legitimate claim to the territory, and he himself is acquainted with the land and Kondaian use of it (apparently they exercised some kind of tariff)[3] because he pastured his flocks there. Ladikos in fact had earlier escorted the judges over the disputed land. It was common for the judges in a land dispute to visit the disputed territory in person, and perhaps this would have occurred prior to the formal trial proceedings in Larisa, if that is in fact where the trial took place. The next witness is an individual from Mopseion, perhaps a certain Antaios. His testimony (lines 21–30) was also given in favour of Kondaia and also described the actual landmarks of the area in dispute; Antaios stated that he knew Kondaians to have been working the land there. The final evidence is that given by three more people from Mopseion, again testifying in favour of Kondaia. It is difficult to determine exactly the nature of the proof they are offering, as a central term that they use is obscure.[4] The witnesses listed here had some claim to neutrality, as none of them were Kondaians. The ability to produce at least ostensibly unbiased witnesses testifying on its behalf would have improved Kondaia's case.

Kondaia's opponent in this arbitration is nowhere identified. Nevertheless, Piccirilli conjectured, on the basis of a comparison with the document discussed in **118**, that the present case was also an interleague arbitration. It would have been an arbitration between the Thessalian city of Kondaia and the Perrhaibian city of Gonnoi. But the evidence does not appear sufficient to warrant such an assumption, and the similarities between this case and **118** are far from striking.[5]

71. Knidos arbitrates between Klazomenai and Temnos (first half of the second century)

Opisthographic marble block, inscribed with two separate decrees (I and II), one on each side, perhaps discovered at Klazomenai. H: 0.78 m (I), 0.96 m (II); w: 0.495–0.515 m; d: 0.16–0.17 m.

2. The temple of Apollo Kerdoios in Larisa was also home to the arbitration document discussed in **153**, and to other inscriptions listed in the appendix (**12** and **18** Appendix).

3. See Raeder, p. 68.

4. κελέτρα: "dub. sens., a point in a boundary, *IG* 9(2).521" (LSJ supp.). For discussions of the term, see the sources collected by Robert, *REG* 1951, 126; id., *REG* 1958, 8; there are two of them under discussion here, one belonging to the Mopseians, the other to the Kondaians (Zekides, *AE* 1901, p. 126).

5. See Robert's criticisms, *REG* 1973, 241.

simply have provided a suitable place to publish a settlement of a land dispute among Thessalian communities nearby.[2]

A shepherd named Ladikos, from Askyris, is the first witness named in the inscription to give his evidence (lines 5–18). He establishes his claim to be an "expert" witness: he knows from his elders that the Kondaians had a legitimate claim to the territory, and he himself is acquainted with the land and Kondaian use of it (apparently they exercised some kind of tariff)[3] because he pastured his flocks there. Ladikos in fact had earlier escorted the judges over the disputed land. It was common for the judges in a land dispute to visit the disputed territory in person, and perhaps this would have occurred prior to the formal trial proceedings in Larisa, if that is in fact where the trial took place. The next witness is an individual from Mopseion, perhaps a certain Antaios. His testimony (lines 21–30) was also given in favour of Kondaia and also described the actual landmarks of the area in dispute; Antaios stated that he knew Kondaians to have been working the land there. The final evidence is that given by three more people from Mopseion, again testifying in favour of Kondaia. It is difficult to determine exactly the nature of the proof they are offering, as a central term that they use is obscure.[4] The witnesses listed here had some claim to neutrality, as none of them were Kondaians. The ability to produce at least ostensibly unbiased witnesses testifying on its behalf would have improved Kondaia's case.

Kondaia's opponent in this arbitration is nowhere identified. Nevertheless, Piccirilli conjectured, on the basis of a comparison with the document discussed in **118**, that the present case was also an interleague arbitration. It would have been an arbitration between the Thessalian city of Kondaia and the Perrhaibian city of Gonnoi. But the evidence does not appear sufficient to warrant such an assumption, and the similarities between this case and **118** are far from striking.[5]

71. Knidos arbitrates between Klazomenai and Temnos (first half of the second century)

Opisthographic marble block, inscribed with two separate decrees (I and II), one on each side, perhaps discovered at Klazomenai. H: 0.78 m (I), 0.96 m (II); w: 0.495–0.515 m; d: 0.16–0.17 m.

2. The temple of Apollo Kerdoios in Larisa was also home to the arbitration document discussed in **153**, and to other inscriptions listed in the appendix (**12** and **18** Appendix).

3. See Raeder, p. 68.

4. κελέτρα: "dub. sens., a point in a boundary, *IG* 9(2).521" (LSJ supp.). For discussions of the term, see the sources collected by Robert, *REG* 1951, 126; id., *REG* 1958, 8; there are two of them under discussion here, one belonging to the Mopseians, the other to the Kondaians (Zekides, *AE* 1901, p. 126).

5. See Robert's criticisms, *REG* 1973, 241.

*P. Herrmann, *MDAI(I)* 29 (1979) pp. 239–71; *SEG* XXIX.1130 *bis* (after Herrmann).

Robert, *REG* 1980, 438; Gruen, p. 110; F. Piejko, *MDAI(I)* 36 (1986) pp. 95–97; *SEG* XXXVI.1040; Thür, pp. 474, 483.

I: Arbitration of Knidos between Temnos and Klazomenai

[?Κρίcις ἂν ἀπεφάναν?]το οἱ αἱρεθέντες [δικα]c[ταὶ τῶν] Ḳνιδίων
[οἷc ἐπέτρεψαν τὰν δ]ι̣ε̣ξαγωγὰν ποιήc̣α̣c̣[θαι . . 6 . .] Ḳ . . ΙΩΝ ὑ-
[πὲρ τ]ῶν ἐ[γκλη]μάτ[ων] ὧν ἐξέθηκαν Τημνῖ̣τ̣[αι κ]α̣ὶ Κλαζομέ-
[νιοι Θ]αλῆc, Ξ̣ε̣νόδ̣ο̣τ̣ος, Ἀ̣γηcικράτης, Πύθων̣, [Κ]α̣φιcόδωρος,
. . . . δωρος δι[εξάγ]οντες ὡς ἐφαίνετο αὐτοῖς δικαι[ό]τατα
[καὶ c]υμφερόντως ἔξειν τοῖc [δ]άμοις καὶ μενεῖν ἃ προϋ-
[πάρξ]αcα φιλία καὶ [ε]ὔ̣γ̣οια ταῖc πόλεcι ποθ' αὑτὰc ἀκολο[ύ]-
[θως τ]ο̣ῖc προγεγενημένοις φιλανθρώποις, ἃ δὲ γενη-
[θεῖc]α̣ περὶ τῶν διαμφιcβατηθέντων ποθ' αὑτοὺc διαφ[ο]-
[ρὰ παύ]cειν, ὑπάρξειν δὲ ἃ ἀποκατάcταcιc εἰc τὰμ φιλ[ί]-
[αν τα]ῖc πόλεcι βεβαία. περὶ μὲν τῶν [κα]τὰ τὸμ πόλεμον
[ἐγκλη]μάτων [ὑπὲ]ρ ὧν ἐνεκάλεcαν ἀλλάλοις Τημνῖτ[αι]
[καὶ Κλ]αζομένιοι, με[γά]λων ὄντων τῶν ἐγκεκλημένων
[καὶ τῶ]ν ποτικατακεχωριcμένων ἐν αὐτοῖc ἀλλοτρίων
[πρὸc ἀπ]οκατ[άc]ταcιν φιλίαc, διατεινόντων δὲ εἰc ἔχ⟨θ⟩ραν τὰν μεγ[ί]-
[cτα]ν, καλῶc ἔξ[ειν] ὑπελάβομεc ἐναντίομ μὲν μηθὲν μηδὲ ἀνο-
[χὰν] τοῖc προϋπάρχουcι φιλανθρώποις καταλείπειν, τὰν δὲ διεξα-
[γωγὰ]ν ποιήcαcθαι ἀκολούθως τᾶι τε τοῦ δάμου προαιρέcει [ἂν καὶ]
[αὐτ]οὶ προεθέμεθα καὶ τῶι cυμφέροντι τῶν ἐπιτρεψάντων τὰ[ν κρί]-
[cιν]. διὸ καὶ κρίνομεc διαλελῦcθαι τὰc πόλειc περὶ τῶν κατὰ τ[ὸμ]
[πόλεμ]ον ἐγκλημάτων καὶ μὴ ἐξῆ{η}μιν ἔτι ἐγκαλέcαι, ἀλλὰ ὑ[πάρ]-
[χειν ἀ]μναcτίαν εἰc τὸν ἀεὶ χρόνον. κρίνομεc δὲ καὶ ὑπὲρ τ[οῦ ἐγ]-
[κλήμ]ατοc οὗ ἐνεκάλεcαν Τημνῖται Κλαζομενίοις ὑπὲρ τ[οῦ τε]-
[μ]έ[ν]ο̣υc καὶ τᾶν ταφᾶν μὴ ἐνόχουc Κλαζομενίουc τοῖc ἐγ[κεκλη]-
[μ]έ̣γ̣οιc διὰ τὸ μηδεμιᾶι χρήcαcθαι ἀποδείξει Τημνίταc τ̣[οῦ ἐγκλή]-
[ματ]οc δί ἅc ἤμελλον φανερὸν ἀμῖν ποιήcειν ὅτι ἀλλοῖ[ά? ἐcτιν τὰ]
[ἐγκε]κλημένα ὑπ' αὐτῶν, πᾶν δὲ τὸ ἐναντίον δηλοῦν δ̣[ιὰ τοῦ ἐγ]-
[κ]λήματοc ὅτι καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐπὶ τὸ ἐγκαλεῖν ἦλθον ποταγγ[ελίαν]
[ψ]εύcαντεc, ποταγγειλάντων αὐτοῖc τινῶν ἐπενβαίν̣[ειν - -]
γ̣ειτονεύοντας καὶ τᾶν cταλᾶν τινας κιν̣ῖ̣ν τᾶν πρ̣[οcοριζου]-
[c]ᾶν τὸ τοῖc θεοῖc ἀνατεθὲν τέμενοc, ἀφαιρεῖcθαι δ[ὲ καὶ τοῦ τε]-
[μ]ένουc τὰ πάτρια καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ τόπου τοῦ εἰc τὰc - - - - - - -
. . c· ταῦτα δὲ ἀποφανάμενοι πάλιν ἐν . ΛΛΟ- - - - - - - - -
. . . ΦΑΝΤΙ τοὺc ἀφοριcμένουc Τ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
τινας κεκινῆcθαι καὶ cυντε[τ]ρ[ίφθαι - - - - - - - - - - -]
καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐπιcκ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
γεγενημένα Α . Ο- -
. α ἐξ ἀρχῆc Ω- -
. . ἐπιγνωc- -

40 . . . ΠΩΝΚΑ- -
. . . . ΑΠ- -

1: [Κρίσις ἂν ἐποιήσαν]το: Piejko. || 2: ποιήσ̣α̣ς[θαι τῶν ἐνε]ς[τώ]των: Piejko. || 21: ἐξῇ ἡμῖν: Piejko. || 26: ὅτι ἀλαθῆ [ἐστιν]: Piejko. || 29: ἐπενβαίν[ειν τοὺς]: Piejko. || 30–31: πε̣[ριωρισμέ|ν]αν: Piejko. || 32–33: τὰς [θυσίας ἀνατεθέν|το]ς: Piejko. || 33–34: ἐν [ἄ]λλωι κ[ριτηρίωι οἱ Τημνῖ|ται] φαντὶ: Piejko. || 34–35: τ[όπους ἐπενβεβᾶσθαι καὶ στάλας]| τινὰς: Piejko. || 35: συντε[τ]ρ[ῖφθαι ὑπὸ Κλαζομενίων ἀδίκως]: Piejko. || 36: ἐπισκ[εψάμενοι περὶ τούτων καὶ ὅτι ἀλαθῶς ἐστι]: Piejko. || 37: ἀ[π]ο[δεῖξαι μὴ δυνάμενοι -: Piejko. || 37–38: [ὑπάρχον|τ]α ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὡ[ς -]: Piejko. || 39: . . ἐπιγνῶσαι: Piejko.

II: Treaty between Temnos and Klazomenai

- - - - - - - - - - - - -ΤΔΣ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - - ἐν τῶι μηνὶ Τ- - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - -Ν καὶ ἐπιπέμπειν τὰς - - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - δεκάτης φέροντα ἐ[π]ηκόου̣ [- - - - - ἐσφρα]-
5 γισμένας τῆι δη{ι}μοσίαι σφραγῖδι ΕΝΔ- - - - - - - - - - -
. ωσαν τὰς δίκας οἱ ἄρχοντες ἑκατέ[ρας τῶν πόλεων - - -]
π̣ονται ἀγορᾶς πληθυούσης χ̣αὶ ἀ̣ν̣α̣γ̣ρ̣αφά[τωσαν - - τὰ ἐγκλήμα]-
τα καὶ ἐχθέτωσαν εἰς τὴν ἀγορὰν ἐφορᾶν τῶι β[ουλομένωι καὶ - -]
. εἰτωσαν τὰς πόλεις καθάπερ γέγραπται ἐ̣ν̣ - - - - - - -Ο . . .
10 ὁποτέρα δ' ἂν τῶν πόλεων μ̣ὴ π̣έμψῃ τὸν ἐ[π]ή[κοον] α̣ἰτήσα̣[ς]-
θαι τὸ δικαστήριον ἀποτεισάτω τῆι ἑτέραι δραχμ[ὰς Ἀ]λεξαν-
[δ]ρείας ἑξακισχιλίας καὶ τοῖς δικαζομένοις α[ἱ δί]χ̣αι γινέσθωσα̣[ν]
τῶι ὕστερον ἐνιαυτ̣[ῶι· ἐὰν δ]ὲ ὁ [ἐ]πήκοος ὁ ἀποσταλεὶς μὴ παραγ[έ]-
νηται εἰς τὴν ἔκκλη̣[τ]ο[ν καὶ τὸ δικας]τήριον μὴ α̣ἰτήσηται, ὀφειλέτω
15 δραχμὰς χιλίας, αἱ δὲ δ̣[ίκ]α[ι τοῖς δι]καζομένοις γ[ινέσθ]ωσαν τῶι ὕ̣σ-
τερον ἐνιαυτῶι, τὸν δὲ ἐπ̣[ήκοον - - - - - - - - - - - - -] κοινω-
νεῖ δίκης μηδεμιᾶς μήτε . Ε . . Η̣[- - μ]ηδε - - - - - - - . ει μη-
δὲ συνηγορείτω μηδὲ ἄλο ἀδικ- - - - - - - - - δ̣ικ[ά]σ̣ηι, ὁ ἐ̣-
πήκοος ὑπόδικος ἔστω καὶ εἰὰν [- - - - - - - τ]ὰ[ς] ἀδι[κίας]
20 ὑ̣πὲ[ρ ὧ]ν ἐπήκοος γεν̣[ό]μενος Ι[- - - - - ἀπο]τεισάτω [ὑ]-
πὲρ αὐ[το]ῦ τὰς καταδίκας ἡ πέμ[ψασα πόλις. ἐπήκο]ον δὲ πέμ-
πειν [ἐν] ἅπασιν τοῖς κατὰ τὸν Λ . . Ο[- - δι]χ̣α[ζ]ο̣[μ]ένοις· ἐὰν δὲ ἀ]-
δύνατος γένηται ἢ τελευτήσ[ῃ πρὶν ἢ τὰς] δίκας συνε̣[ελ]εσθῆνα[ι,]
ἄλλον ἀ[π]οστελλέτω ἡ πόλις [ἐπήκοον] δ̣ικαστηρίου. ὁρκιζέτωσαν
25 δὲ οἱ εἰσαγωγεῖς ἱεροῖς νεοκαύ̣[τοις ἐν]αντίον τοῦ ἐπηκόου καθ' ἑκάσ-
την ἡμέραν, τὰ δὲ ἱερὰ παρέχ[ειν] τ[αῖς μ]ὲν Α . . . Γ̣ΕΛΩΝ δίχ[αις] τὴμ πόλιν
τὴν εἰσάγουσαν τὰς [δί]κας, ἐν δὲ τ[ῆι ἐ]κκλ[ήτω]ι ἀμφο[τέρα]ς τὰς πό-
λεις. ὁ δὲ ὅρκος ἔστω [ὅδ]ε· δικῶ τὰς δίκας [Τη]μ̣νίταις [καὶ Κλ]αζομε-
ν̣ίοις καὶ τοῖς μετο[ίκοι]ς καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς το[ῖς] κατοικ[οῦσι]ν ἐν ταῖς
30 πόλεσιν πρὸς οὕς [εἰσι]ν αἱ δίκαι κατὰ τὰς συνθήκας· π̣[ερὶ ὧ]ν δὲ μὴ
γέγραπται ἐν τῆι συνθήκηι γνώμηι τῆι δικαιοτά[τη]ι καὶ τὰς τιμητὰ[ς]
δίκας τὰς καταδικασθείσας τιμήσω τῆς ἀξίας, καὶ δῶρα οὐκ ἔ-
λαβον οὐδε λήψομαι τῶ[ν δ]ικῶν ἕνεκεν οὔτε αὐτὸς ἐγὼ οὔτε ἄλ-

λος ἐμοὶ οὔτε ἄλλη{ι}ο[ὔτε τ]έχνηι οὔτε παρευρέσει οὐδεμιᾶι, καὶ κα-
τὰ μάρτυρα οὐ δικῶ ἐὰ[ν] μή μοι δοκῆι τἀληθῆ μαρτυρεῖν· ἐπομνύ-
τω δὲ θεοὺς τοὺς ὁρκίους εὐορκοῦντι μέμ μοι εὖ εἶναι, ἐφιορκοῦν-
τι δὲ τἀναντία. ο[ὓ]ς οὐ δεῖ δικάζειν· μὴ δικάζειν πατέρα παιδ[ὶ]
μηδὲ παῖδα πατρὶ μ[ηδ]ὲ ἀδελφοὺς ἀδελφῶι μηδὲ ἀδελφιδοῦς
μηδὲ πάτρωας μηδ[ὲ] μήτρωας μηδὲ γαμβροὺς μηδὲ πενθεροὺς
μηδὲ κοινωνοὺ[ς τῆ]ς [δί]κης μηδὲ προξένους μηδὲ τοὺς εἰσαγωγεῖς
τῶν δικῶν μηδ[ὲ τοὺς τρ]εφομένους ὑπὸ τῆς πόλεως· ἐὰν δέ τις πα⟨ρὰ⟩ ταῦ-
τα δικάσηι οὗς ἡ [συνθή]κη ἀπείργει, ἀποτισάτω ὁ δικάσας τῶι δικαζο-
μένωι τὸ πέμπ[τον μέ]ρος τοῦ ἐπιγράμματος τῆς δίκης ἣν ἐδίκασεν
καὶ τῆς δίκης ὑπ[όδικο]ς ἔστω. μηδὲ ἐπήκοος τούτων μηδεὶς πορευέσθω.
ἐὰν δέ τις τῶν ἐ[ν τῆι c]υγγενείαι τῆι προγεγραμμένηι ἐπήκοος πορευθῆι,
ἀποτεισάτω τῆς δ[ίκη]ς τὸ πέμπτον μέρος τῶι ἀντιδίκωι καὶ τῆς βλάβης ὑ-
πόδικος ἔστω τῶι ἀδ[ικ]ουμένωι. καθ' ὅτι δεῖ τοὺς ἀντιδίκους διόμνυσθαι·
διόμνυσθαι δὲ τοὺς ἀντιδίκους ἐν τῶι δικαστηρίωι πρὶν λέγειν τὰς δί[κας]
τοῖς ἱεροῖς οἷς καὶ οἱ δικασταὶ ὀμνύουσιν καὶ προσομνύτω· δῶρα οὐκ ἔδ[ωκα
οὐδὲ]
δώσω τῆς δίκης ἕνεκεν οὔτε αὐτὸς ἐγὼ οὔτε ἄλλος ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ οὔτ[ε ἄλ]-
λη{ι}οὐδεμιᾶι παρευρέσει καὶ ἐπαράσθωσαν εὐορκοῦντι μὲν εὖ ε̣ἶ̣ν̣[αι, ἐφιορ]-
κοῦντι δὲ τἀναντία. ὑπὲρ δὲ τῶν ὀρφανῶν καὶ ὧν ἄλλος κύριο[ς, τούτους
ἐπο-
μόσασθαι τοῖς κυρίοις. ἐὰν δέ τις ἀποσταλεὶς κατὰ συνθήκα[ς ὑπὲρ ἄλλου]
δικάζηται, διομνύσθω ἐπομόσαι αὐτῶι τὸν ἀποστείλαντα [ἐναντίον τοῦ ἐ]-
πηκόου καὶ τῶν ἀρχόντων ἀληθῆ εἶναι τὴν διωμοσίαν, προσο[μνύτω δὲ ἀληθῆ]
δοκεῖν εἶναι αὐτῶι ὑπὲρ ὧν δικάζεται ὑπὲρ οὗ ἀπεστάλη- - - - - -
. ηι δίκην ὀμνύτω τοῖς ἱεροῖς οἷς καὶ οἱ δικασταὶ πρὶν λέ[γειν τὰς δίκας δο]-
[κ]εῖν αὐτῶι δίκαιον εἶναι νικᾶν ὑπὲρ οὗ λέγει· τὴν δ[ὲ - - - - - -]
ὡς ψευδομαρτυρίων. ἐάν τις θέληι τῶν μαρτ[υρ- - - - - -]
. α ψευδῆ μαρτυρῆσαι, ἐπισκηψάσθω πρὸ ΤΟ- - - - - - - - - -
τῆς μαρτυρίας τῆς μαρτυρηθείσης - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
ἅμα πάντων ἐπιλαμβανέσθω καὶ Π[- - - - - - - - οἱ ἀντί]-
[δ]ικοι δότωσαν σεσημασμένη[ν τῆι δημοσίαι σφραγῖδι - - - - -]
[μα]ρτυριων, ἐν δὲ τῆι πόλε[ι - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
- - - - - γένωται ΤΩ- -
- -

1: -ΤΑΣ-: Piejko. || 2: ἐν τῶι μηνὶ τ[ῶι name of the month]: Piejko. || 4: ἐπήκοον: Piejko. || 5–6: perhaps [ἐξαγγειλά|[τ]ωσαν: Herrmann. δημοσίαι ("parasitic" iota) σφραγῖδι ἐνδ[εικτικῶς καὶ εὐσήμως. προειπά|τ]ωσαν: Piejko. || 6–7: ἑκατέ[ρας τῶν πόλεων, ὅσοι τότε καταστή]|σονται: Piejko. || 7–8: ἀγαγραψά[τωσαν εἰς λεύκωμα τὰ ἐγκλήμα]|τα: Piejko. || 8–9: β[ουλομένωι, καὶ παρακα|λ]είτωσαν: Piejko. || 9: ἐν̣ [συνθήκαις (rejected by Herrmann) πέμψαι ἐπηκ]ό[ους]: Piejko. || 16: ἐπ̣[ήκοον περὶ τούτων μόνον δικάζειν, μήτε ἄλλης]: Piejko. || 17: [λ]ε[ίπ]η[ι τὴν ἀγομένην, μηδὲ ὑπὲρ ἄλλων ἐρ]εῖ: Piejko. || 18: δίκ[η]ς ἧι or δικ[ά]σηι: Herrmann. || 18–19: ἀδίκ[ημα ἀκουέτω ὅταν] δικάσηι. ὁ ἐ|πήκοος: Piejko. || 19: [τ]ὰ[ς] ἀδι[κίας] or [κ]α[τ]αδί[κας]: Herrmann. [ἐξελεγχθῆι ἔνοχος ἔστω τ]α[ῖς] ἀδι[κίαις]: Piejko. || 20: π̣[αραβέβηκεν

τοὺς νόμους. ἀπο]τεισάτω: Piejko. || 21: ἡ πέμ[ψασα πόλις τῆι ἑτέραι]: Piejko. || 22: ν[όμ]ο[ν διαδι]χα[ζ]ο[μ]ένοις: Piejko. || 23: τελευτήσ[ηι - -] συντελεσθῆναι: Piejko. || 26: perhaps τ[αῖς μ]ὲν ἀ[π' ἀγ]γέλων δίκ[αις] or τ[ῶν μ]ὲν α[ὐτο]τελῶν δικ[ῶν]: Herrmann, who considered the first to be the better conjecture. δ[ι' ἀγ]γέλων: Piejko. || 50–51: [ἄλ]|ληι ("parasitic" iota): Piejko. || 59–60: μαρτ[υριῶν τινα ὡς γενόμε]|να: Piejko. || 60: πρὸ το[ῦ, infinitive or ἥ]: Piejko. || 63–64: [μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων]| μαρτυριῶν: Piejko.

The first of these two documents, in the Doric dialect, is a decree of Knidos publishing the judgement reached by certain Knidians in an arbitration between Temnos and Klazomenai. This arbitration was largely concerned with charges that the two states were pressing against each other in the aftermath of a war between them that was only recently over. The second text, in *koine*, is perhaps the Klazomenian copy of what was apparently a joint agreement between Temnos and Klazomenai regarding future arbitration between them. Thus we have examples here of the two recognized types of arbitration, compromisary and obligatory. In the first text, the Knidian judges began by proclaiming their judgement to the two states that had submitted their claims to them for settlement.[1] The duty of the judges was to judge the claims of Temnos and Klazomenai as justly as possible and to the advantage of both states, insofar as that was possible, and to restore the friendship that had previously existed between the two cities (lines 5–11). This latter goal was clearly the most important; as we discover farther on (lines 20–22), the dikasts simply dismissed, rather than judged, all claims and charges arising from the war between the two parties, all of them charges that the judges considered to be inimical to the restoration of good relations between the disputing states (lines 11–16).[2] In their motivation, then, they were conciliators rather than judges; nevertheless, they had the authority of judges and acted as such.

It was the charges arising from the recent hostilities that the Knidian judges apparently considered to be the chief impediment to peace and the renewal of friendship between the two states. Nevertheless, there was another charge outstanding, one that the Temnitans had levelled against the Klazomenians (lines 22f.). This accusation seems to have dealt with trespass and violation of a sacred precinct, perhaps in territory that Temnos considered to be its own. Clearly, however, part of the required procedure was the production of reliable proof or witnesses; the Knidians dismissed the charges against the Klazomenians when the Temnitans were unable to give any proof of their claim. The Temnitan accusations appear to have risen from secondhand information given them by

1. Lines 1–4. For the term διεξαγωγή (line 2) and διεξάγω (line 5) cf. **67, 9** Appendix, and Polyb. 5.15.

2. The judges also outlawed any further claims, at least as far as the war was concerned, in the future. For another instance of ἀμνηστία, cf. **108**, line 36.

some other people; perhaps this accounts for their inability to produce proof (lines 28f.).

The second text deals at length with the procedure to be used in future arbitrations between Temnos and Klazomenai, an example of "obligatory" arbitration outlined in a treaty.[3] The first portion of the agreement (as we have it) is concerned with the selection of an ἐπήκοος, or delegate who would be responsible, when the need for arbitration arose, for initiating a tribunal in the ἔκκλητος πόλις.[4] Default of this responsibility, on the part of city or individual, was punishable by a fine of 6,000 Alexandreian drachmai for the city, 1,000 for the individual (lines 10–16).[5] The next several lines are very fragmentary, but they appear to contain stipulations ensuring the nonpartisan position of the ἐπήκοος. If he violated any of these stipulations, he was to be liable to prosecution himself. An ἐπήκοος had to be dispatched on all occasions of litigation that required the tribunal in the ἔκκλητος πόλις; perhaps these occasions were specified in another document or elsewhere in this one. If for any reason he could not fulfill his duties, the city was obliged to send another one (lines 21–24).

The regulations regarding the delegate are followed by those regarding the εἰσαγωγεῖς.[6] These officials were to take an oath in the presence of the delegate every day while the trials were under way. There is a certain difficulty in these

3. Cf. **13**, **47**, **48**, **67**, **83**, **92**, **108**, **164**, **170**. See **100** for a similar conjunction of specific arbitration and general agreement. The detailed provision for numerous and frequent suits might suggest that this arbitration treaty was primarily constructed to deal with future disputes between private individuals, rather than with interstate conflict. But this is not certain; nor would it be impossible for similar machinery to be used for both.

4. For the ἐπήκοος, cf. **83**, where these officials were delegates of the litigant states, who brought their state's case before the court. On the ἔκκλητος πόλις, cf. **13**, **47**, **48**, **74**, **90**.

5. For other defaults or transgressions in arbitration clauses for which a fine is stipulated, cf. **47**, **48** (10,000 drachmai), **28**, **42**, **138** (10,000 drachmai for a city, 1,000 for an individual), **83** (20 talents for a city, 5 for a private citizen, by far the largest of such prefixed fines).

6. This term, if it is to be connected to the appearance of τὴμ πόλιν| τὴν εἰσάγουσαν τὰς [δί]κας (lines 26–27), should refer to individuals who would act in some capacity as prosecutors for their state. But the difficulty of determining the role played by these officials is complicated by the matter of the oath that follows (lines 28–37). At lines 24–25 it is stated that the εἰσαγωγεῖς were to take their daily oath; it is natural to assume that the oath that follows a few lines later is theirs. But the oath is a classic *dikast's* oath and cannot be that of any other official involved in the arbitration. Even if we were to conjecture that the εἰσαγωγεῖς *had* some judicial capacity in this case, that notion becomes impossible when we read a few lines later (lines 40–41) that they were specifically *excluded* from judging. There appears, then, to be some problem in the inscription as it stands; something seems to be missing, such as a break between the discussion of the εἰσαγωγεῖς (lines 24–28) and the citation of the oath (lines 28–37). At this point one would expect a new introduction and discussion of the judges, before proceeding to the judges' oath. There is no problem with the stone, so perhaps something was left out of the original inscription.

lines (26–28). The city pursuing or prosecuting a case is said to be responsible for providing the sacrifice in certain kinds of cases,[7] while in the suits heard in the ἔκκλητος πόλις, which are clearly meant to be opposed to the first kind, both cities are responsible for providing the offerings. It may be that a distinction is being made between suits that were capable of being settled without recourse to a third party, the regulations for which may have been found in the lost beginning of this document, and those cases that had to be referred to the neutral third city. The oath that follows the regulation of the activities of the εἰσαγωγεῖς is the oath of the judges: in it they promise to judge justly, evaluate penalties fairly, take no bribes, and scrutinize testimony severely. This oath is standard and quite similar to other judges' oaths.[8]

After the judges' oath comes a regulation of degrees of affinity of those who are excluded from acting as judge or ἐπήκοος (lines 37–41); this is mostly a matter of familial relationships, but also includes *proxenoi*, participants in the suits, the εἰσαγωγεῖς of the suits, and those brought up by the city. The fact that familial relationships play such a large part in these regulations indicates that here it is perhaps a matter of suits to be tried in one or the other of Temnos or Klazomenai, not in a third city foreign to both.

The opponents in the suits, the ἀντίδικοι, were also required to swear an oath that they have not and will not offer bribes (lines 47–52). Regulations were set down for proxies acting for interested persons, and strict procedures regarding the oaths of all parties were set out in order to ensure that honesty was maintained in this situation (lines 53–58). The final part of the inscription as it stands is concerned with false witness and prosecution for perjury, perhaps also with regulations for the acceptance of written as well as oral testimony.

72. The conference at the Aous between Flamininus and Philip V (198)

I: Livy 32.10.
II: Diodoros 28.11.

Matthaei, *CQ*, pp. 260–61; Walbank, *Philip V*, pp. 151–52; Badian, *FC*, pp. 70f.; Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 2, pp. 550–51; Briscoe, *Books XXXI-XXXIII*, pp. 185–86; Will, vol. 2, pp. 153f.; Gruen, pp. 102–3; Eckstein, *Senate and General*, pp. 274f.; id., *Historia* 37 (1988) p. 420; Hammond/Walbank, *Macedonia*, vol. 3, p. 424.

7. Unfortunately the text is mutilated at a point that might have clarified the distinction that is being made here. See Herrmann, pp. 266f.

8. Cf. the oaths in **21**, **129**.

lines (26–28). The city pursuing or prosecuting a case is said to be responsible for providing the sacrifice in certain kinds of cases,[7] while in the suits heard in the ἔκκλητος πόλις, which are clearly meant to be opposed to the first kind, both cities are responsible for providing the offerings. It may be that a distinction is being made between suits that were capable of being settled without recourse to a third party, the regulations for which may have been found in the lost beginning of this document, and those cases that had to be referred to the neutral third city. The oath that follows the regulation of the activities of the εἰσαγωγεῖς is the oath of the judges: in it they promise to judge justly, evaluate penalties fairly, take no bribes, and scrutinize testimony severely. This oath is standard and quite similar to other judges' oaths.[8]

After the judges' oath comes a regulation of degrees of affinity of those who are excluded from acting as judge or ἐπήκοος (lines 37–41); this is mostly a matter of familial relationships, but also includes *proxenoi*, participants in the suits, the εἰσαγωγεῖς of the suits, and those brought up by the city. The fact that familial relationships play such a large part in these regulations indicates that here it is perhaps a matter of suits to be tried in one or the other of Temnos or Klazomenai, not in a third city foreign to both.

The opponents in the suits, the ἀντίδικοι, were also required to swear an oath that they have not and will not offer bribes (lines 47–52). Regulations were set down for proxies acting for interested persons, and strict procedures regarding the oaths of all parties were set out in order to ensure that honesty was maintained in this situation (lines 53–58). The final part of the inscription as it stands is concerned with false witness and prosecution for perjury, perhaps also with regulations for the acceptance of written as well as oral testimony.

72. The conference at the Aous between Flamininus and Philip V (198)

I: Livy 32.10.
II: Diodoros 28.11.

Matthaei, *CQ*, pp. 260–61; Walbank, *Philip V*, pp. 151–52; Badian, *FC*, pp. 70f.; Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 2, pp. 550–51; Briscoe, *Books XXXI-XXXIII*, pp. 185–86; Will, vol. 2, pp. 153f.; Gruen, pp. 102–3; Eckstein, *Senate and General*, pp. 274f.; id., *Historia* 37 (1988) p. 420; Hammond/Walbank, *Macedonia*, vol. 3, p. 424.

7. Unfortunately the text is mutilated at a point that might have clarified the distinction that is being made here. See Herrmann, pp. 266f.

8. Cf. the oaths in **21**, **129**.

I: Livy 32.10

Diesque quadraginta sine ullo conatu sedentes in conspectu hostium absumpserant. Inde spes data Philippo est per Epirotarum gentem temptandae pacis; (2) habitoque concilio delecti ad eam rem agendam Pausanias praetor et Alexander magister equitum consulem et regem, ubi in artissimas ripas Aous cogitur amnis, in colloquium adduxerunt. (3) summa postulatorum consulis erat: praesidia ex civitatibus rex deduceret; iis, quorum agros urbesque populatus esset, redderet res quae comparerent; ceterorum aequo arbitrio aestimatio fieret. (4) Philippus aliam aliarum civitatium condicionem esse respondit: quas ipse cepisset, eas liberaturum; quae sibi traditae a maioribus essent, earum hereditaria ac iusta possessione non excessurum. (5) si quas quererentur belli clades eae civitates, cum quibus bellatum foret, arbitro quo vellent populorum, cum quibus pax utrisque fuisset, se usurum. (6) consul nihil ad id quidem arbitro aut iudice opus esse dicere; cui enim non apparere ab eo, qui prior arma intulisset, iniuriam ortam, nec Philippum ab ullis bello lacessitum priorem vim omnibus fecisse? (7) inde cum ageretur, quae civitates liberandae essent, Thessalos primos omnium nominavit consul. ad id vero adeo accensus indignatione est rex, ut exclamaret: "quid victo gravius imperares, T. Quincti?" (8) atque ita se ex colloquio proripuit.

II: Diodoros 28.11

Ὅτι τῶν Ἠπειρωτῶν πρέσβεις πεμψάντων πρὸς Φίλιππον καὶ Φλαμίνιον, Φλαμίνιος μὲν ᾤετο δεῖν τὸν Φίλιππον ἐκχωρεῖν ἁπάσης τῆς Ἑλλάδος, ὅπως ἀφρούρητος ᾖ καὶ αὐτόνομος, ἀποδοῦναι δὲ καὶ τοῖς παρεσπονδημένοις τὰς βλάβας εὐδοκουμένως. ὁ δὲ ἔφη δεῖν τὰ μὲν παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῷ καταλελειμμένα βεβαίως ἔχειν, ὅσα δὲ τυγχάνει προσηγμένος, ἐκ τούτων ἐξάγειν τὰς φρουράς, περὶ δὲ τῆς βλάβης κρίνεσθαι. εἰπόντος δὲ πρὸς ταῦτα Φλαμινίου μὴ δεῖσθαι κρίσεως, δεῖν δὲ αὐτὸν τοὺς πεπονθότας πείθειν, καὶ διότι παρὰ τῆς βουλῆς ἐντολὰς ἔχοι ταύτας ὅπως μὴ μέρος τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἀλλὰ πᾶσαν αὐτὴν ἐλευθεροῦν, ὑπολαβὼν ὁ Φίλιππος, "καὶ τί τούτου βαρύτερόν," φησιν, "προσετάξατ' ἄν μοι πολέμῳ κρατήσαντες;" καὶ ταῦτ' εἰπὼν ἐχωρίσθη διωργισμένος.

The Aous conference in 198 between Philip V and Flamininus is in some ways a locus classicus of the clash between Greek and Roman concepts of diplomacy. The senate was now making harsher demands than it had two years previously (**59**). And while arbitration was mentioned by both sides, Philip's offer of arbitration failed to mesh with Flamininus's demand of it. In 200, Rome had delivered an ultimatum that demanded that Philip stop making war on the Greeks. Now Rome insisted that Philip evacuate Greece entirely. In other words, not only was Philip to relinquish conquests he had achieved himself; he was also to give up ancestral Macedonian holdings: Demetrias, Chalkis, and Corinth—the so-called fetters of Greece. Philip's response was not surprising. After a year and a half of fighting the Romans, he was willing to submit to terms in keeping with the demands made at Abydos in 200: he would give up his own

conquests, but not territories that he had inherited. This concession, however, was no longer deemed sufficient by the Romans. The truly significant failure of Roman and Greek to apprehend each other's methods of diplomacy came with Flamininus's demand that Philip submit to arbitration. Flamininus stated that Philip must make restitution of property, insofar as this was possible, to those states that had suffered his depredations. For the rest, he was to submit to impartial arbitration that would evaluate the amount of compensation he was to pay for lost, damaged, or destroyed property. Although the details differ somewhat from the terms of the ultimatum given at Abydos in 200, the spirit behind this demand that Philip submit to arbitration was really the same. Both in 200 and 198, the clear Roman assumption was that Philip was guilty of aggression and various crimes. As far as they were concerned, the only task of an arbitral tribunal would be to determine the degree of his guilt and sort out the details.

In 200, Philip had tried to point out that he had legal right on his side. In 198, he agreed to go to arbitration with any state that had complaints against him. But from the tenor of Flamininus's response to Philip's apparent acquiescence, it seems that what Philip agreed to in his own mind was arbitration "on the merits of his case," *not* a neutral assessment of the damages he was obligated to pay.[1] This was not acceptable to Flamininus. Rome had determined, had in fact known from the start, that Philip was "guilty." Everyone knew that Philip was guilty. There was no need for a judge or arbitrator to settle that point. As far as the Romans were concerned it was a nonissue. The final straw at the Aous conference was Flamininus's suggestion that Philip begin his good work by freeing Thessaly. Thessaly, of course, had been a Macedonian buffer state since the time of Philip II. The mention of the Thessalians at this point was sufficient to destroy whatever hope of success the conference had remaining.

73. Rome intervenes between Antiochos III and Attalos I (198)

I: Livy 32.8.9–16.
II: Livy 32.27.1.

Cf. Livy 33.20.8–9.

Holleaux, *Études*, vol. 3, pp. 331–35; E. Badian, *CPh* 54 (1959) pp. 82–83; McShane, pp. 132–33; Hansen[2], p. 63; Briscoe, *Books XXXI–XXXIII*, pp. 183,

1. Briscoe, p. 187. Although the passages can be understood to read that Philip agreed to arbitration in exactly the way that Flamininus demanded it, it seems unlikely, given Flamininus's response. For the view that Flamininus misunderstood Philip (far from impossible!) and only *thought* that the king was offering arbitration on the general question of war guilt, see Gruen, pp. 102–3.

conquests, but not territories that he had inherited. This concession, however, was no longer deemed sufficient by the Romans. The truly significant failure of Roman and Greek to apprehend each other's methods of diplomacy came with Flamininus's demand that Philip submit to arbitration. Flamininus stated that Philip must make restitution of property, insofar as this was possible, to those states that had suffered his depredations. For the rest, he was to submit to impartial arbitration that would evaluate the amount of compensation he was to pay for lost, damaged, or destroyed property. Although the details differ somewhat from the terms of the ultimatum given at Abydos in 200, the spirit behind this demand that Philip submit to arbitration was really the same. Both in 200 and 198, the clear Roman assumption was that Philip was guilty of aggression and various crimes. As far as they were concerned, the only task of an arbitral tribunal would be to determine the degree of his guilt and sort out the details.

In 200, Philip had tried to point out that he had legal right on his side. In 198, he agreed to go to arbitration with any state that had complaints against him. But from the tenor of Flamininus's response to Philip's apparent acquiescence, it seems that what Philip agreed to in his own mind was arbitration "on the merits of his case," *not* a neutral assessment of the damages he was obligated to pay.[1] This was not acceptable to Flamininus. Rome had determined, had in fact known from the start, that Philip was "guilty." Everyone knew that Philip was guilty. There was no need for a judge or arbitrator to settle that point. As far as the Romans were concerned it was a nonissue. The final straw at the Aous conference was Flamininus's suggestion that Philip begin his good work by freeing Thessaly. Thessaly, of course, had been a Macedonian buffer state since the time of Philip II. The mention of the Thessalians at this point was sufficient to destroy whatever hope of success the conference had remaining.

73. Rome intervenes between Antiochos III and Attalos I (198)

I: Livy 32.8.9–16.
II: Livy 32.27.1.

Cf. Livy 33.20.8–9.

Holleaux, *Études*, vol. 3, pp. 331–35; E. Badian, *CPh* 54 (1959) pp. 82–83; McShane, pp. 132–33; Hansen[2], p. 63; Briscoe, *Books XXXI–XXXIII*, pp. 183,

1. Briscoe, p. 187. Although the passages can be understood to read that Philip agreed to arbitration in exactly the way that Flamininus demanded it, it seems unlikely, given Flamininus's response. For the view that Flamininus misunderstood Philip (far from impossible!) and only *thought* that the king was offering arbitration on the general question of war guilt, see Gruen, pp. 102–3.

219; H. R. Rawlings, *AJAH* 1 (1976) pp. 3f.; Will, vol. 2, p. 179; Mehl, pp. 146–47.

I: Livy 32.8.9–16

Attali deinde regis legatos in senatum consules introduxerunt. ii regem classe sua copiisque omnibus terra marique rem Romanam iuvare quaeque imperarent Romani consules, impigre atque oboedienter ad eam diem fecisse cum exposuissent, vereri dixerunt, (10) ne id praestare ei per Antiochum regem ultra non liceret; vacuum namque praesidiis navalibus terrestribusque regnum Attali Antiochum invasisse. (11) itaque Attalum orare patres conscriptos, si sua classi suaque opera uti ad Macedonicum bellum vellent, mitterent ipsi praesidium ad regnum eius tutandum; si id nollent, ipsum ad sua defendenda cum classe ac reliquis copiis redire paterentur. (12) senatus legatis ita responderi iussit: quod rex Attalus classe copiisque aliis duces Romanos iuvisset, id gratum senatui esse; (13) auxilia nec ipsos missuros Attalo adversus Antiochum, socium et amicum populi Romani, nec Attali auxilia retenturos ultra, quam regi commodum esset; (14) semper populum Romanum alienis rebus arbitrio alieno usum; et principium et finem in potestatem ipsorum, qui ope sua velint adiutos Romanos, esse; (15) legatos ad Antiochum missuros, qui nuntient Attali naviumque eius et militum opera adversus Philippum communem hostem uti populum Romanum; (16) gratum eum facturum senatui, si regno Attali abstineat belloque absistat; aequum esse socios et amicos populi Romani reges inter se quoque ipsos pacem servare.

II: Livy 32.27.1

Eodem anno legati ab rege Attalo coronam auream ducentum quadraginta sex pondo in Capitolio posuerunt gratiasque senatui egere, quod Antiochus legatorum Romanorum auctoritate motus finibus Attali exercitum deduxisset.

In 198 Antiochos the Great was still a "friend and ally" of Rome.[1] Nevertheless, his new interest in Asia Minor was detrimental to another friend and ally of Rome, Pergamon. When Antiochos encroached on the territory of Attalos, therefore, the Pergamene king turned to their mutual friend Rome for help.[2] Rome, of course, would not give military aid to Attalos against Antiochos, although the senate did authorize Attalos's departure from the scene of the

1. Livy 32.8.13: *socium et amicum populi Romani*. It is questionable just how close an "alliance" Antiochos had with Rome.

2. There is a fair amount of controversy over the historicity of these events; see Hansen, Holleaux, and McShane, who argues that Antiochos was in Syria in 198, and therefore Livy probably made at the least a chronological error in "anticipating" Antiochos's progress into Asia Minor by a year or two. Badian, on the other hand, argues in favour of accepting the general veracity of Livy's account, as does Will, who points out that the actual invasion of Asia Minor could have been carried out by an agent of Antiochos rather than Antiochos himself. See also Rawlings.

Macedonian war in order to deal with the Seleukid threat himself. Instead, the Romans sent a neutral message to Antiochos, encouraging peace between both parties, a message that evidently worked. Antiochos was anxious to maintain friendship with Rome at that time and graciously withdrew his forces from the territory of Attalos. In fact, as Livy presents the tale, so friendly were feelings all around that the Roman legates were scarcely called upon to mediate between Antiochos and Attalos. The mere expression of Roman wishes was at this time sufficient to persuade the Seleukid king.

74. Rhodes arbitrates a territorial dispute between Priene and Samos (c. 197–190)

An inscription, some fragments, and references from other inscriptions, all from the wall of the temple of Athena Polias at Priene.

I: A very long inscription on a series of blocks from the wall of the temple. For the epigraphic details see Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene* 37.

Böckh, *CIG* 2905; LeBas/Waddington 189–94, 205; Cauer[2] 178, 179; Hicks, *BMus* 403; van Gelder, *SGDI* 3758; Berard 39, XI; *Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene* 37; Dittenberger/Hiller von Gaertringen, *SIG*[3] 599 (lines 1–44); Schwyzer 289.

II: *IPriene* 38 (= *BMus* 409) is a collection of small fragments in Rhodian dialect that may well belong to the same document as above.
III: *IPriene* 40, lines 7–8 (discussed in **160** [I]).
IV: *IPriene* 41, lines 9–12 (discussed in **160** [II]).

The third inscription included in **160** (III), a new boundary delineation between Samian and Prienian holdings, contains numerous references to boundary markers set up "by the Rhodians."

Sonne 18; Lenschau, *LS*, pp. 121–22, 203f.; E. Preuner, *Hermes* 29 (1894) pp. 530f.; P. Foucart, *RPh* 20 (1896) pp. 87f.; H. van Gelder, *Geschichte der alten Rhodier* (The Hague, 1900) pp. 132f.; U. von Wilamowitz, *SPAW* 25 (1906) pp. 41f.; E. Bousquet, *BCH* 35 (1911) p. 464; Raeder 34; Tod 62; C. D. Buck, *CPh* 8 (1913) p. 151; F. Mezger, "Inscriptio Milesiaca de pace cum Magnetibus facta" (Diss., Munich, 1913) pp. 10–11, 41, 46, 49–50; Meyer, *Grenzen*, pp. 80f.; Steinwenter, pp. 177, 188; K. J. Beloch, *GG*[2] IV.2 (1927) pp. 548f.; *SEG* IV.474; A. Wilhelm, *AAWW* 67 (1930) pp. 106–8; de Taube, pp. 42–44; Tod, *Sidelights*, pp. 56f.; Préaux, pp. 250, 251, 279; Robert, *REG* 1968, 471; H. Bengtson, *SBAW* 1971, III, pp. 31–32; Klose, p. 147 n. 635; Robert, *REG* 1972, 421; Will, vol. 1, pp. 370–71; Berthold, pp. 148–49; L. Migeotte, *L'emprunt public dans les cités grecques* (Quebec and Paris, 1984) 92; S. M. Sherwin-White, *JHS* 105 (1985) pp. 69–89;

Macedonian war in order to deal with the Seleukid threat himself. Instead, the Romans sent a neutral message to Antiochos, encouraging peace between both parties, a message that evidently worked. Antiochos was anxious to maintain friendship with Rome at that time and graciously withdrew his forces from the territory of Attalos. In fact, as Livy presents the tale, so friendly were feelings all around that the Roman legates were scarcely called upon to mediate between Antiochos and Attalos. The mere expression of Roman wishes was at this time sufficient to persuade the Seleukid king.

74. Rhodes arbitrates a territorial dispute between Priene and Samos (c. 197–190)

An inscription, some fragments, and references from other inscriptions, all from the wall of the temple of Athena Polias at Priene.

I: A very long inscription on a series of blocks from the wall of the temple. For the epigraphic details see Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene* 37.

Böckh, *CIG* 2905; LeBas/Waddington 189–94, 205; Cauer[2] 178, 179; Hicks, *BMus* 403; van Gelder, *SGDI* 3758; Berard 39, XI; *Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene* 37; Dittenberger/Hiller von Gaertringen, *SIG*[3] 599 (lines 1–44); Schwyzer 289.

II: *IPriene* 38 (= *BMus* 409) is a collection of small fragments in Rhodian dialect that may well belong to the same document as above.
III: *IPriene* 40, lines 7–8 (discussed in **160** [I]).
IV: *IPriene* 41, lines 9–12 (discussed in **160** [II]).

The third inscription included in **160** (III), a new boundary delineation between Samian and Prienian holdings, contains numerous references to boundary markers set up "by the Rhodians."

Sonne 18; Lenschau, *LS*, pp. 121–22, 203f.; E. Preuner, *Hermes* 29 (1894) pp. 530f.; P. Foucart, *RPh* 20 (1896) pp. 87f.; H. van Gelder, *Geschichte der alten Rhodier* (The Hague, 1900) pp. 132f.; U. von Wilamowitz, *SPAW* 25 (1906) pp. 41f.; E. Bousquet, *BCH* 35 (1911) p. 464; Raeder 34; Tod 62; C. D. Buck, *CPh* 8 (1913) p. 151; F. Mezger, "Inscriptio Milesiaca de pace cum Magnetibus facta" (Diss., Munich, 1913) pp. 10–11, 41, 46, 49–50; Meyer, *Grenzen*, pp. 80f.; Steinwenter, pp. 177, 188; K. J. Beloch, *GG*[2] IV.2 (1927) pp. 548f.; *SEG* IV.474; A. Wilhelm, *AAWW* 67 (1930) pp. 106–8; de Taube, pp. 42–44; Tod, *Sidelights*, pp. 56f.; Préaux, pp. 250, 251, 279; Robert, *REG* 1968, 471; H. Bengtson, *SBAW* 1971, III, pp. 31–32; Klose, p. 147 n. 635; Robert, *REG* 1972, 421; Will, vol. 1, pp. 370–71; Berthold, pp. 148–49; L. Migeotte, *L'emprunt public dans les cités grecques* (Quebec and Paris, 1984) 92; S. M. Sherwin-White, *JHS* 105 (1985) pp. 69–89;

SEG XXXVII.876; Shipley, pp. 29–37, 194, 266–68; A. Chaniotis, *Historie und Historiker in den griechischen Inschriften* (Stuttgart, 1988) pp. 113–14, 129–30, 355–58; Daverio Rocchi, pp. 170–77; O. Curty, *Historia Testis*, ed. M. Pierart (Fribourg, 1989) pp. 21–35; Billows, pp. 211, 255, 260; Ager, *Historia* 40 (1991) p. 24.

I: *IPriene* 37: the Rhodian arbitration

a Πριηνέω[ν καὶ C]αμίων.
Εὐφανίςκος Καλλιξείνου, καθ' ὑοθ[ε]-
cίαν δὲ Νικαcιδάμου, Ἀγήcανδρο[c]
Ἐὐδάμου, Τιμαγόρας Πολεμακλεῦc, [Νι]-
5 κόcτρατος Τειcύ[λου, . . . α]νδρος Ἑ[κα]-
τωνύμου αἱρεθέν[τες ὑπὸ το]ῦ δά[μου]
b τοῦ Ῥοδίω[ν ἀποφαίνεcθαι? περὶ τᾶ]c χώρας ὑπὲρ
ἃc ἀμ[φιcβατοῦντι Cάμι]οι ποτὶ Πριανε[ῖc κ]αὶ Πρι-
[ανε] . . . . . οις καὶ τοῦ φρουρίου δ καλεῖ[τ]αι Κ[ά]-
10 ριον, ὑπὲρ οὗ ἀμφιcβατοῦντι Cάμιοι καὶ Πριανεῖc,
ἀξιωθέντος τοῦ δάμου ὑπὸ Caμίων καὶ Πριανέ-
ων ἄνδρας ἀποδεῖξαι, οἵτινες κρινοῦντι καὶ ὁρι-
ξοῦντι καὶ ἀποφανοῦνται ἢ cυλλυcοῦντι, δικαιολο-
γηcα[μένω]ν τῶν αἱρεθέντων ὑπὸ μὲν Caμίων
c -
- -
15 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -ΣΩ[- - - τοῦ]
. . . θίωνος, [ὑπὸ δὲ Πριανέων] Ἀπολλοδώρου
[το]ῦ Πο[c]ε[ιδωνίου, φύcει δὲ Ἀρτεμ]ιδώρου, Καλλι-
d κράτευς τοῦ Ἀπολλωνίου, Παρραcίου τοῦ Παρραcίο[υ],
Μητροδώρου τοῦ Ἀριστοδήμου, Ἀλκιcθένευς τοῦ
20 Ἀνύτου, καὶ διακούcαντες αὐτῶν ἔν τε Ῥόδωι ἐν
τῶι ἱερῶι τοῦ Διονύcου καὶ ἐπὶ τᾶc χώρας τᾶc ἀμφιcβα-
[τουμέ]νας ἐφ' ἃν ἐπάγαγον ἀμὲ ἑκάτεροι καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ
[φρουρί]ου δ καλεῖται Κάριον καὶ ἐν Ἐφέcωι ἐν τῶι ἱερῶι
[τᾶc Ἀρτέμι]δοc, ἐπο[ιηcάμεθα τὰν] κρίcιν κατὰ τὰ ὑφ'
25 [ἁμῶν ἐφε]ορα[μέ]να, καὶ ἐκρί]ναμεν ε[ἶμειν?]
e [τὸ φρούριον δ κα]λεῖται Κάριον κα[ὶ τ]ὰμ [περὶ]
[αὐτὸ χώ]ραν ἐπείμειν Πριανέων· τὰν δὲ ἀπόφα[cιν]
[δόν]τες ὑπὲρ τούτων καὶ ποιήcαντες ἀντίγραφα
[δύο], ἐδώκαμεν τὸ μὲν ἓν τοῖc πρυτάνεcι τοῖc Caμίων
30 Πρωτομάχωι Τρίτωνος, Cιμαλίωνι Εὐφράνορος, Θεο-
μνήcτωι Ἰcοκράτευc, Ἡγεπόλει Ἀντιπάππου, Λυcιμά-
χωι Διονυcίου, καὶ τῶι γραμματεῖ τᾶc βουλᾶc Μενίπ-
[π]ωι Κλέωνος, ὡc μὲν Ῥόδιοι ἄγοντι, ἐπὶ ἱερέως Πρατο-
f [φάνευς, μηνὸc - - - - - - -, ὡc δὲ Cάμιοι]
35 [ἐπὶ δαμιοργοῦ - - - - - μηνὸc - - - - - - -]
[- - - - -, τὸ δὲ ἄλλο ἐδώκαμεν τοῖc Πριανέων - -]
- -

[- - - - - - - - - - - -, τῶι δεῖνι - - - - - - -]
g1 ου τοῦ Φιλοτίμου καὶ Λυκίππωι? Ἀντιόχου - - - -
- -
40 [. ? Ἀ]πολλοδώρου, Εὐφά[νει] Ἀρτεμιδώρου, Διο[κλεῖ καὶ Ἀ]-
[π]ολλοδώρωι Ποσειδωνίου, Cωτ[- - - - - - - - - -, Φι]-
[λ]ώτα[ι] Παμ⟨μ⟩ένο[υ], ὡς μὲν Ῥόδιοι ἄγοντι μηνὸς
Πανάμου ἐνάται [ἐπὶ δέκα or ἐπ' ἰκάδι], ὡς δὲ Πριανεῖς [μην]ὸ[c Θαργη]-
λ⟨ι⟩ῶνο[c - - day. - -. ἔφαcαν δὲ Cάμιοι τὰν χώραν]
45 τὰν Βατ[ινᾶτιν - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
g2 . . . . τοὺc δ- -
Πριαν̣[εῖ]c μετὰ Μελιέ̣[ων - - - - - - - - - - πόλιν?]
μίαν ἔ̣[χειν], cτάcιοc δὲ γε[νομένας - - - - - - - - - -]
h1 -
- -
- -
. . . . . I- -
. . . . . ΓΟ- -
- -
- -
- -
h2 τοὺc [- Μιλη?]-
cίουc -
νοc K/- -

lacuna

i1 . . c. 15? . . Κάριον καὶ Δρυοῦ[ccαν, καὶ ἐπε]δείκν̣[υον ἐν]
[ταῖc Μαιανδρ]ίου τοῦ Μιλη̣cίου ἱcτο[ρίαιc κατακε]χωριcμ[ένον,] i2
55 [διότι καὶ ἁ] λοιπὰ χώρα ἁ Μελιὰc [ὑπὸ Ἰώνων κοινο]ῦ? αὐτοῖc ἐ-
[δόθη μ]ετὰ τὸμ πόλεμον τὸμ Με[λιακὸν, ἐφ' ὥι νέμε]cθαι αὐτᾶ[c . .]
. . . . . παρὰ μὲν Μιλη̣cίων ΑΙ[- - καὶ ἐπὶ? τοῖ]c αὐτοῖc Θή[βαc]
[καὶ Μ]αραθήcιον, καθὼ̣[c καὶ τὸ Ἰώνων κοιν]ὸν ὑπὲρ αὐ[τῶν]
[ἔκρινε] Πανιωνίοις [ἐν cυλλόγωι, παρὰ] δὲ Κολοφωνίω[ν]
k Ἄναια -
ὑπὲρ τ̣- -
ἐνεφ[άνιξαν? or ἐν Ἐφ[έcωι - - - - - - - - καθὼc ἐπέ]-
βαλλ[ε· ἔ]φα̣c̣α̣[ν δὲ Πριανεῖc - - - - - - - - - - - -]
τοῦτο τ̣οῖ̣c̣ ?- -

(7–8 lines of k missing)

65 [- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - ἐπὶ cτεφαναφόρου Μακαρέως]
l [τοῦ μ]ε̣τὰ Ἀθηναγόραν cυμφυγεῖν εἰc τὸ K[άρι]ον, φρουραρχοῦν-
[τοc ἐν]ὸc τῶν πολιτᾶν, καὶ τόν τε φρούραρ[χο]ν̣ καὶ τοὺc φύλα-
[κας] διὰ τὸ αἱρεῖcθαι τὰ τοῦ τυράννου πάν[τ]ας διαφθε⟨ῖ⟩ραι, καὶ
[ὑπὲ]ρ τούτων ἐπεδείκνυον ψάφιcμ[α τ]ὸ ἀπο[cτ]αλὲν ποτὶ
70 [αὐ]τοὺc ὑπὸ τῶν περὶ τὸν τύραννο[ν κ]αὶ τὰ ψαφίcμα[τ]α̣ τὰ
[ἀποcτ]α̣λέντα πὸτ αὐτοὺc καθ' ὃν̣ καιρὸν ἦcαν ἐκπεπ[τω]-
[κότεc ὑ]πὸ τῶν περὶ τὸν τύραννο̣ν καὶ cυμπεφ[ευ]γότεc

m1 εἰς τὸ Κάριον, ἃ ἦν ὑπὸ πλειόνων πολίων ἀπε[στα]λμένα· ἐπ[ε]- m2
δείκνυον δὲ καὶ τὸ ψάφισμα ὃ ἔγραψαν ποτὶ τὸν δᾶμον τὸν
75 [Ῥ]οδίων, ἐόντες ἐν τῶι Καρίωι, ὑπὲρ τοῦ καταγαγε[ῖ]ν αὐτοὺς εἰς
τὰν πόλιν, καὶ Πριανέων ποτὶ τοὺς βασιλ[έας Δη]μήτριόν τε καὶ
Λυσίμαχον ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν δύο [ψα]φ[ί]σμ[ατα], κα[ὶ] ἄλλο ψάφισμα
παρὰ Ῥοδίων ὑπὲρ τοῦ καταφυγε[ῖν το]ὺς περὶ [τὸν τ]ύραννον, καὶ ἄλ-
λο ὑπὲρ ὅπλων δόσιος καὶ ποτὶ Ῥοδίους ὑπὲρ δανεισμοῦ
80 χρημάτων· ἔφασαν δὲ καταλυθείσας τᾶς τυραν-
n νίδος, ἃ ἐ[γ]έ[νετο ἐπ' ἔτ]η τ[ρ]ία, κατελθόντες ἐκ τοῦ Καρίου ἐς τὰμ
πόλιν ἐπὶ ct[εφα]ναφόρου Λύκου, καὶ τὸ φρούριον ἔχειν καθὰ
καὶ πρότερο[ν, κ]αὶ τ[ὰν χ]ώραν νέμεσθαι· καὶ μετ' ἐνιαυτὸν
ἐπὶ στεφανα[φόρου Καλ]λιστράτου τᾶς ἀπολειπομένας
85 [ἐν] τῶι τόπωι δ[αμοσίας χ]ώρας ἀπ[οδ]ό̣ς̣θ̣[αι] μέρη τινὰ διελόν-
o [τες εἰς κλά]ρους τριάκοντα ἑπτά, καὶ παρεδείκ[νυον]
[καὶ δύο? ἄ]λλα ψαφίσματα ὑπάρχοντα ἐν τῶι ἱερ[ῶι περὶ]
[τοῦ] λά̣χο[υς] τριάκοντα καὶ ἑπτὰ κλάρων, καὶ [ἐπὶ στεφανα]-
[φόρου . . . . . ὅς ἐς]τι ἀπὸ Καλλιστράτου πέμπτος, [ἀποδόσθαι]
90 [μέρη τινά, διελόντες εἰς] ἄλλους κλάρους πέντε. ἔφα[σαν δὲ Σάμιοι]
[. . . . . ὑπὸ Πριανέων τὸ φρού]ριον αὐτῶν παραιρῆσθαι καὶ - - - -
. . . . . c. 25 . . . . . ἀποστέλλοντες ποτὶ Λυ[σίμαχον - - - - -]
. . . . . c. 23 . . . . . τὸ φρούριον αὐτῶν παραιρ[ῆσθαι]
[. . . . . c. 29 . . . . . τ]οῦ τυράννου κατ- - - - - -
95 . . . . . c. 31 . . . . . ο̣ν ἀποστεῖλαι ποτ[ὶ - - - -]
[. . . . . c. 32 . . . . . πο]τὶ Λυσίμαχο[ν - - - - -]

pq (17–18 lines missing)

r1 Σάμου, παρε . . . . ΑΙον δὲ καὶ καθ' ὃν καιρὸν -
ἐπιστολὰς ὑπὸ Ἀγησάρχου, ἐν αἷς ὑπὲρ μὲν ἰδιω̣[τικᾶν ἀμφισβασιᾶν ἐλέγετο,
ὑπὲρ δὲ τοῦ Καρίου] r2
καὶ τᾶς περὶ τὸ Κάριον χώρας οὐθεὶς ἀμφεσβάτει· [νῦν δὲ τοὺς Σαμίους
ἀποστεῖλαι ποτὶ τὸν δᾶμον]
100 τὸν Ῥοδίων ἐγκαλοῦντας ὅτι χώρας τε πλῆθο[ς νέμοιντο Πριανεῖς παρὰ τὸ
δίκα]ιον [καὶ μάλιστα τὸ]
Κάριον, ὑπὲρ οὗ νῦν διακρίνεσθαι. οἱ δὲ Σάμιοι τά τε [τῶν ἱστ]ο[ρι]ο[γράφω]ν
[μαρτύρια ὑφαγ]ήσαντο
καθὰ καὶ ἐπὶ τᾶς κρίσιος τᾶς ὑπὲρ τοῦ Βατινήτου, ἀπὸ [τούτων π]ειρού[μενοι]
δεικνύειν διότι
τὸ Κάριον καὶ ἃ περὶ τοῦτο χώρα αὐτοῖς ἐπικλα[ρωθείη, καὶ καθ' ὃν καιρ]ὸν
διαιροῦντο τὰν τῶν Μελιέων
χώραν, λαχεῖν αὐτοὶ Κάριον καὶ Δρυοῦσσαν κατὰ τὰ [ἐν ταῖς ἐπ]ιγραφομέναις
Μαιανδρίου τοῦ Μι-
105 ληςίου ἱστορίαις κατακεχωρισμένα, διότι λάχο[ιεν Κάριον καὶ Δρ]υοῦσσαν·
μετὰ δὲ τὰν παράταξιν
τὰν γενομέναν αὐτοῖς ποτὶ Πριανεῖς ἐπὶ Δρυΐ καὶ νίκας κρίσιν ἔχειν, [καὶ]
ταύταν τὰν χώραν ἐν ταῖς συνθήκαις

αὐτῶν γενέσθαι· ὁρίξασθαι γὰρ πὸτ αὐτοὺς ὡς ὑδάτων ῥοαί· καὶ παρ[είχ]οντο
ἱστοριογράφους τοὺς μαρτυ-
ροῦντας αὐ[τοῖς], ὅτι μὲν τὸ Κάριον ἔλαχον μετὰ τὸν Μελιακὸν πόλ[εμον,
ὅτε] διωρίξαντο ποτὶ τοὺς
Πριαινε[ῖς ὡς ὑδάτ]ων ῥοαί, Εὐάγωνά τε καὶ Ὀλύμπιχον κ[αὶ] Δοῦριν, [τὸ]
δὲ Κάριον ἔφασαν αὐτῶν κατα-
s λαβέσθαι Πριανε[ῖς τ]ο[ὺς ἐκπ]εσόντας ὑπ[ὸ] τ[οῦ Ἱέρωνος τοῦ προσποιησα-
μένου τὰν τυραννίδα καὶ τῶν περὶ αὐτόν,]
ἐξ οὗ ὁρμουμένους κατατρέχειν καὶ κακοποιεῖν τόν τε Ἰέ[ρωνα καὶ τοὺς τὰ
αὐ]τὰ τῶι Ἱέρωνι αἱρε[υμένους, καὶ κα]-
τασχόντας ἔτη τρία κατελθεῖν εἰς τὰμ πόλιν ἐκπολιορκηθέντος τοῦ τυράννου
τοῦ ἐν τᾶι [πόλει· καὶ]
μηκέτι προέσθαι Πριανεῖς, ἀλλ' [ἔχ]ειν ἔστε καὶ τὸν νῦν χρόνον [τοὺς ἐκγό-
ν]ους αὐτῶν· τᾶς δὲ χώ[ρας τᾶς περὶ αὐ]-
τὸ ἄρξασθαι αὐτοὺς ἐπιβαίνειν καθ' ὃν καιρὸν κατελθόντες [ἐς Πριάναν
ἐπύθοντ]ο δοκιμασίαν πεποι[ῆς]-
115 θαι πάντας Σαμίους καὶ ἀπογραφὰν τᾶς τε ἐν τᾶι νάσωι καὶ τᾶς [ἐ]ν [τᾶι]
π[ε]ρ[αίαι γᾶς, καὶ μὴ ἂν] γενέ[σθαι πὸτ αὐ]-
τοὺς ἀμφισβασίας διὰ τὸ ἐκ πλείονος χρόνου τὰν ἀπογραφὰν ποιεῖσθαι·
λαβομ[ένους δὲ Πρια]νεῖς ἐπεμβαί-
νειν τᾶς χώρας αὐτῶν, ὅθεν ὤιοντο δεῖν ἀποδοθήμειν τὸν ἐξ ἀρχᾶς μὲν ἴδι[ον
αὐτῶν γενόμεν]ον κλᾶρο[ν,]
ὕστερον δὲ παραιρεθέντα ὑπὸ Πριανέων. ἁμὲς δὲ θεωροῦντες τοὺς γράψαντας
τὸμ [πόλεμον τὸμ] Μελια-
κὸν καὶ τὰν διαίρεσιν τᾶς χώρας τοὺς μὲν ἄλλους πάντας φαμένους ἐκ τᾶς
διαιρέσιος λ[αχ]ό[ντας Σαμίους]
120 Φύγελα, καίπερ ὄντας τέσσερας μὲν Σαμίους· Οὐλιάδην καὶ Ὀλύμπιχον καὶ
Δοῦριν καὶ Εὐάγωνα, δύο δὲ Ἐφεσίους·
Κρεώφυλον καὶ Εὐάλκη, Χῖον δὲ Θεύπομπον, οὓς πάντας ἐν ταῖς ⟨ἱ⟩στορίαις
εὑρίσκομεν κατακεχωρικότας διότι ἔλαχον
Φύγελα· μόνον δὲ ἐν ταῖς ἐπιγεγραμμέναις Μαιανδρίου τοῦ Μιλησίου ἱστο-
ρίαις κατακεχωρισμένον διότι ἔλαχον
Σάμιοι Κάριον καὶ Δρυοῦσσαν· αἷς πολλοὶ τῶν συγγραφέων ἀντιγράφοντι,
φάμενοι ψ[ευδε]πιγράφους εἶμεν

t (7–8 lines missing)

[- - - - - - - - ἐπὶ στεφαναφόρου Μακαρέως - - - - - - - -]
u1 [κ]αὶ ἐκπεσεῖν μὲν Καρ[ίου] . . 8 . . ΟΣΙΑ? καὶ [- - - - - κατελθεῖν ἐπὶ
στεφαναφό]-
125 ρου Λύκου, ὅς ἐστι ἀπὸ Μακαρέως τέταρτος· ποτὶ δὲ τὸν Λυσίμαχον ἀ[ποστ]εῖ-
λαι ὑπὲ[ρ τ]οῦ Βατινήτο[υ ἐπὶ στε]- u2
φαναφόρου τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ μετὰ Νίκανδρον, ὅς ἐστι ἀπὸ Λύκου πεντε[και]δέ-
κατος, καὶ ἀπὸ κήνου τοῦ χρόνου
ἐχόντων αὐτῶν καὶ τὸ φρούριον καὶ τᾶς χώρας τᾶς περὶ τὸ φρούριον [πε]πρα-
κότων κλάρους τεσσεράκοντα
καὶ δύο, οὐκ ἀγανακτῆσαι τοὺς Σαμίους οὐδ' ἀποστεῖλαι πὸτ αὐτοὺς π[ρ]εσ-
βείαν ἐγκαλοῦντας ἐπὶ τοῖς διωι-

κημένοις, ἀλλὰ ἀμφισβασίας μὲν πόθ αὐτοὺς ἰδιωτικὰς γεγόνειν? [π]αρορίας
τοὺς? ἐκ τοῦ Καρίου οὐκ ἀμφες-
130 βατήκειν τοὺς Σαμίους, ἀλλὰ τοὐναντίον ἐν τῶι ποτὶ Λυσίμαχον ἀ[ποστ]αλέντι
ψαφίσματι γεγράφθαι, διότι
Πριανεῖς ἔχοντι τὰν αὐτῶν χώραν· μετὰ δὲ τὰν ἀναφερομέναν [ἐπ]ὶ Λυσιμάχου
κρίσιν γεγόνειν δια-
γενομένων ἐτῶν πλειόνων, βασιλεύοντος Ἀντιόχου τοῦ Ἀντιόχου, [γε]νομέ-
νων περὶ αὐτοὺς καιρῶν δυσχε-
[ρῶν], πέμψαι πὸτ αὐτοὺς Σαμίους [πρέσβεις λέγοντας], ὅτι ἐν παρορία[ι]
ἐνεκάλουν, ὑπὲρ δὲ Καρίου οὐθὲν
[εἰρηκέναι - - - - -]θα περὶ [αὐτ]οὺς τὸν Λαοδίκειον πόλεμον, ἐν ὧι
135 [- - - - - - - πεμφθέν]τ[ος δὲ πὸ]τ αὐτοὺς ἐπιστάτα Σίμωνος, ὃν χ[ρό]-
x [νον - - - - - - - - -] τὰς οὐσίας καταγαγεῖν εἰς τὰμ πό[λιν]
[- - - - - - - ποτ]ὶ τὸν γενόμενον διάδοχον τᾶς βασιλείας Φί-
[λιππον - - - - ἀ]ποδόμειν τὰν χώραν ἂν ἔχοντες ἐξέπεσον ὑ-
[πὸ - - - - - κατελ]θόντες δὲ εἰς τὰν πόλιν νέμεσθαι τὰν χώ-
140 [ραν - - - - - παρα?]βαίνοντας τὰς χώρας τὰς ὁμόρους ἃς αὐ-
[τοὶ - - - - - - - - ἐ]πὶ τᾶς Ἀντιγόνου βασιλείας, ὅθεν καὶ α
[- - - - - - - ἀμφισβατ]οῦντας τοῖς Πριανεῦσι διότι παρορίζον-
[ται - - - - ἀγανακτ]ῆσαι καὶ ἀποστεῖλαι πρεσβείαν ποτὶ Ἀντί-
[γονον - - - - - - - τ]ε παρορίζεσθαι αὐτῶν καὶ τὰν ἐν τῶι
145 [- - - - - - - - - - -] γράψαι πὸτ αὐτοὺς, διότι κρίνει ἐπὶ μὲν
[- - - - - - - - -] Ἀλεξάνδρου διαβάντος εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν ἐνέμον-
[το - - - - - - - -] τοὺς πρεσβευτα{ι}ς τοὺς παρὰ τῶν Σαμί-
[ων - - - - - - ἐνέμοντ]ο [ταύτ]αν τὰν χώραν, καὶ ἐπ' Ἀντ[ι]-
[γόνου - - - - - - ἐν ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς] ταῖς βασιλικαῖς εὑρε-
y [θ- - Ἀντίο- or Λυσίμα]χον τὸμ βασιλῆ ὑπ[ὲρ] τᾶς κρίσιος - -
151 [- - - μν]αμονεύοντας, καὶ πά[λ]ιν ἐπ' Ἀντιόχου τοῦ βασιλέως
[- - - ὑπὲ]ρ τοῦ παρορίζεσθαι τὰγ χώραν, ὑπὲρ τοῦ φρουρίου οὐθ[ὲ]ν
[εἰρηκότας, καὶ ποτὶ? - - Ἀν?]τίοχον τὸν ὑπὸ βασιλέως Πτολεμαίου τεταγ-
μένον
[- - - ὑπὲρ τοῦ φρουρί]ου οὐθὲν εἰρηκότας, καὶ διὰ τὰς ἄλλας αἰτίας τὰς κατα-
155 [κεχωρισμένας - - - -] ἀφ' οὗ τὰμ πόλιν οἰκοῦντι παραδεικνύντας ὅτι καὶ τὸ
φρούριον
[καὶ ἁ περὶ τὸ φρούριον χώρα - - - π]άντα δίκαια τὰ εἰρημένα ὑπὸ Πριανέων
καὶ κατακεχ[ωρισμένα]
[- - ἐκρίνομεν τὸ φρούριον καὶ τὰν περὶ τ]ὸ φρούριον χώραν εἶμειν Πριανέων
- -
z ὅρους δὲ ἀπεδείξαμεν τᾶς τε Σαμίας καὶ Πριανίδος χώρας, ἀρχόμενοι, ὡς
μὲν Σάμιοι ποταγορεύοντι, ἀπὸ τῶν
κατὰ Σανίδειαν τόπων, ὡς δὲ Πριανεῖς, ἀπὸ Θινίχου πάγου, τὸν πρᾶτον λόφον
τὸν πετρώδη τὸν ὑπερκεί-
160 μενον ὑπὲρ τὰ ἐργάσιμα, ἐφ' οὗ καὶ ὅρον ἐπεκολάψαμεν. ἐφ' οὗ ἀνατείνει
ἁ ἐκ τοῦ παρακειμένου ποταμοῦ
φάραγξ ἁ ἀναφέρουσα παρὰ τὰ ἐργάσιμα· ἃς μεταξὺ καὶ τοῦ προγεγραμμένου
λόφου ἄλλον ὅρον ἐπὶ πέτρας

ἐπεκολάψαμεν, ὥστε τὰ μὲν ὑπὸ τὸν λόφον καὶ τὰμ φάραγγα καὶ τοὺς ἐπικολαφθέντας ὅρους εἶμειν Καμίων,
τὰ δὲ ὑπὲρ τὸν λόφον καὶ τὰν φάραγγα καὶ τοὺς ἐπικολαφθέντας ὅρους εἶμειν Πριανέων· ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ λόφου τοῦ
πράτου ἀποδειχθέντος, ὅς ἐστι ὑψηλότατος, ἄλλον ὅρον ἐπεκολάψαμεν ἐν τῶι καταλήγοντι τοῦ λόφου· ἀπὸ δὲ τούτου
ἐπ' εὐθείας ἄλλον ἐθήκαμεν ὅρον· ἀπὸ δὲ τούτου ἐπ' εὐθείας πάλιν ἐθήκαμεν ὅρον· ἀπὸ δὲ τούτων ἐπ' εὐθείας ἁ φάραγξ
ὁρίζει ἔστε τὸν ὅρον ὃν ἐθήκαμεν παρὰ τὰν φάραγγα· ἀπὸ δὲ τούτου ἀναβαίνουσι ποτὶ τὸν πετρῶνα ἄλλον ὅρον
ἐπεκολάψαμεν εἰς τὸν πέτρον· ἀπὸ δὲ τούτου ἐν τῶι πετρῶνι ἄλλον ὅρον ἐπεκολάψαμεν· ἀπὸ δὲ τούτου ὡς
παραφέρει παρὰ τὸν βουνὸν εἰς τὸ ἀπολῆγον αὐτοῦ ὅρους ἐπεκολάψαμεν ⟨δύο⟩· ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν ἐγκολαπτῶν ὅρων εἰς τὸν ἀπέ-
ναντι βουνὸν τὸν λεπρὸν ἐθήκαμεν ὅρον, καὶ ἀπὸ τούτου παρὰ τὸν βουνὸν ἔστε καὶ τὰν φάραγγα ἐθήκαμεν ἄλλον ὅρον· ἀπὸ
δὲ τούτου [καὶ παρὰ ταύ]ταν κατέναντι τοῦ ὄρευς διαβάντων τὸν ποταμὸν ἄλλον ἐθήκαμεν ὅρον· ἀπὸ δὲ τούτου ἐπιστρέψαν-
[τες -]

Only Hiller von Gaertringen's *apparatus* has been reproduced for those editions previous to the new and revised reading of *IPriene*. 1: HvG, *IPriene*, suggests that κρίσις περὶ χώρας is to be restored, or at least understood here. || 7: ἀποφάνασθαι: HvG, *SIG*^{3}, Schwyzer. || 8–9: καὶ Πρι|[ανέων ἐποίκ]οις?: HvG, *IPriene* (after Wilamowitz). Πρι|[ανεῖς Καμί]οις: HvG, *SIG*^{3}; Schwyzer. || 14: δικαιολογησά[ντω]ν "also possible": Prott (*ap. IPriene*) || 36: [τοῖς Πριανέων στραταγοῖς] suggested by HvG, *SIG*^{3}. || 41–42: Σωτ . . . . . [τῶι δεῖνι Φι|λ]ώτα ππαμενον (*sic* = Ἐπαμείνονι?): Hicks. || 43: [ἄγ]ο[ντι]: Hicks. [μην]ὸ[ς]: Wilamowitz. || 45: Βατ[ινῆτιν]: Schwyzer. || 46: δ[ὲ]: Shipley, p. 29. || 47–48: [πολε]|[μίαν or [Κα]|[μίαν: Shipley, p. 30. || 55: Μελιὰς [ἐπικλαρωθείη] αὐτοῖς ἐ . . .: Hicks. Μελιὰς [c. 13 letters]υ αὐτοῖς: Prott. || 57: Ἀκ[άδαμιν]: Shipley, p. 34. || 81: ἐπέ[σχεν ἔτ]η: Hicks. || 85: δ[ιαιροῦντες? χ]ώρας: Hicks. || (before 97): [ἔφασαν δὲ Πριανεῖς]: Schwyzer. || 99–105: [μετὰ ταῦτα δὲ (Καμίους) πρεσβείαν ἀποστεῖλαι ποτὶ τὸν δᾶμον]| τὸν Ῥοδίων ἐγκαλοῦντας ὅτι χώρας τε πλῆθο[ς μέγα? νέμοιντο Πριανεῖς παρὰ τὸ δίκαι]ον? [καὶ δὴ καὶ τὸ]| Κάριον, ὑπὲρ οὗ νῦν διακρίνεσθαι. οἱ δὲ Κάμιοι τὰ τε[κμήρια τὰ παρὰ τῶν ἱστ]ο[ρι]ο[γράφω]ν [εἰσηγ]ήσαντο| καθὰ καὶ ἐπὶ τᾶς κρίσιος τᾶς ὑπὲρ τοῦ Βατινήτου, ἀπο[λογούμενοι καὶ π]ειρού[μενοι δεικνύειν διότι| τὸ Κάριον καὶ ἁ περὶ τοῦτο χώρα αὐτοῖς ἐπικλα[ρωθείη, καὶ καθ' ὃν καιρ]ὸν διαιροῦντο τὰν τῶν Μελιέων| χώραν λαχεῖν αὐτοὶ Κάριον καὶ Δρυοῦσσαν κατὰ τὰ [περὶ τούτων? ἐν ταῖς ἐπ]ιγραφομέναις Μαιανδρίου τοῦ Μι|λησίου ἱστορίαις κατακεχωρισμένα, διότι λάχο[ιεν Κάμιοι Κάριον καὶ Δρ]υοῦσσαν·: Wilhelm, *AAWW* 67. || 107: ὁρίξασθαι: Chandler. ὁρίσασθαι: Hicks. || 112: [πόλει· τὸ δὲ Κάριον]: van Gelder. || 115: καὶ μὴ ἂν: Wilamowitz. || 124: Καρ[ίου ἔτη διακ]όσια καὶ [-κοντα κατασχόντας]: Schwyzer. || 129: HvG, *IPriene*, suggests a phrase more to be expected would be ἀμφισβασίας ἰδιωτικᾶς γεγονεί[ας π]αρορίας το[ῖ]ς ἐκ τοῦ Καρίου. || 135: ΤΑΥΤΟΥΣΕΠΙΣΤΑΤΑΣΣΙΜΩΝΟΣΟΝΧ: Hicks fac-

simile. But Hicks's edition reads [πο]τ' αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ στασίμων ὅσο[ν χ|ρόνον]. || 137–38: HvG, *IPriene,* records that Wilamowitz pointed out the uncertainty of this restoration, and that [Ἀντίοχον or Σέλευχον] τὸν διάδοχον τᾶς βασιλείας φι|[λανθρώπως] was also a possibility.

II: *IPriene* 38

a - - -Ἰμα- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
νοντο - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
νας - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
γενόμενο[ν - - - - - - - - - τοὺς Ἱερι]-
ανεῖς καὶ το- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

b - - - - - - - -ον Ἀθ- - - - - - - - - - \ΙΑΛΙΙ- - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - -α τε κηνο- - - - - - - - -θήμειν τ- - - - - - - - -

c [- - - - - ἀμφ]ισβατοῦντας ὑπὲρ τοῦ Βατινήτο[υ - - - - - - -]
- - - - - - - -ν ἐμ πράγμασιν αὐτὸν εἶμεν κ- - - - - - - - -
[- - - - - πολ]έμου ποτὶ τὰς πόλει[ς μ]ήτε κ- - - - - - - - -

d - - - - - - - - - - - -νον καὶ -
[- - - - - - - - - - τ]ὸ Κάριον -
- - - - - - - - - - -ιγράψαν[τ- -]
- - - - - - - - - - -ων ἀπόφ[ασιν -]
5 - - - - - - - - - - -γεα, Ἐφεσ[ίους δὲ Κρεώφυλον
καὶ Εὐάλκη, - - - - - - - - -]
[- - - - - ἱστοριογρά]φους Σα[μίους μὲν Οὐλιάδην καὶ Ὀλύμπιχον καὶ Δοῦριν
καὶ Εὐάγωνα],
[- - - - - Χῖον δὲ Θε]ύπομπον, [οὓς πάντας ἐν ταῖς ἱστορίαις εὑρίσκομεν
κατασχεχωρικότας]
[- - διότι ἔλαχον Σάμι]οι Φύγελ[α, μόνον δὲ ἐν ταῖς ἐπιγεγραμμέναις Μα-
ιανδρίου τοῦ Μιλησίου ἱστορίαις κατασχεχωρισμένον]
[διότι ἔλαχον Σάμιοι Κ]άριον κ[αὶ Δρυοῦσσαν, αἷς πολλοὶ τῶν συγγραφέων
ἀντιγράφοντι φάμενοι]
10 [- - - - - - - - ψευδε]πιγρά[φους εἶμειν - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]

e - - - - - -κατε- -
[- - - -ε]νεγκ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -ωι τῶ[ι - - - -]
- - - - - -ου ποτ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -ου κατ- - - - -
[- - - το]ὺς πρεσ[βευτὰς - - - - - - - - - - - - - -] τῶι τ- - - - -

f [- - - - - τὸ φ]ρούρ[ιον - - - - - -]
[- - - - - - - ν]ῦν τ[ε - - - - - - -]
- - - - - - - - -εν τ- - - - - - - - -

g - - - - - - -
παρθένον
[ἐ]ξενεγκεῖν
- - - -ρους

h - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
[- - - Ἀντ]ίγονον - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - ἔγκλημα - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - -θαι καὶ - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - κατέχ[ρινε - - - - - - -]
5 - - - - - -υτων τὸ - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - καταγα[γ- - - - - - - -]
- - - - - - ὑπὸ τᾶ[c - - - - - - - -]
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

a 1: [Λυc]ιμα[χ-?]: Hiller von Gaertringen. || b 2: [κατ]ά τε κῆνο[ν καιρὸν ἀποδο]θήμειν τ[ὰν χώραν]?: Hiller von Gaertringen.

III: *IPriene* 40: senatorial arbitrátion (**160**)

[καὶ ὅca Πριηνεῖc λέγουcιν ἐπὶ το]caῦτα ἔτη κατέχειν ἐκείνης τῆc χώρας
8 [περὶ τούτων οὕτω καθὼc καὶ Ῥοδίοι κ]ε[κ]ρίκαcιν, οὕτως δοκεῖ εἶναι·

IV: *IPriene* 41: senatorial arbitration (**160**)

ὅπως οὕτω[c ὦ]cιν καθὼc ὁ δᾶμος ὁ Ῥοδίων
10 ἑκατέρων θελόν[τ]ων ἔκρινεν· περὶ τούτου τοῦ πράγματο[c ἀποκρι]θῆναι
οὕτως ἔδοξεν· ἡμῖν οὐκ εὐχ[ερ]ές {εἶναι}ἐcτιν μετα-
θεῖναι ἃ ὁ δᾶμοc ὁ Ῥοδίων ἑκατέρων θελόντων κέκρι[κε κ]αὶ ὁρ[ιcμὸν] πε-
ποιήται, {ΤΟΥ}⟨ἵνα⟩ μ[ὴ] τούτωι τῶι κρίματι καὶ τού[τοις τοῖc ὁρίοις]
ἐμμείνωcιν·

The lengthy text *IPriene* 37 (I) is a Rhodian decree that was inscribed on the wall of the temple of Athene Polias at Priene, the same provenance as the inscription recording the decision in the dispute between Miletos and Priene (**100**), and the *senatus consulta* of a later period regulating the resurgent border dispute between Priene and Samos (**160**). This appears to have been Priene's official place of publication of the awards in boundary disagreements with its neighbours, or at least of those successful for Priene. In spite of the large number of inscriptions unearthed from the temple, no record has been found of the decision of Lysimachos, which probably favoured Samos (**26**), nor has a contemporary record been found of the decision of Manlius in 188, which certainly favoured Samos (**99**). Temples, as sacred yet public places, were suitable for the display of international agreements of importance, and aside from the popular venues of the great international sanctuaries such as Delphi and Olympia, local temples acquired their own collections of documents.[1] Inscription I contains the decision of five Rhodian judges in the territorial dispute between Priene and Samos over regions in the peninsula of Mykale. It is

1. For a discussion of the Athena Polias archives, see Sherwin-White, *JHS* 105.

the contemporary document intended to publicize the findings of the court and provide a copy of those findings for future reference. But it is not the only source of evidence for this Rhodian arbitration. The Roman arbitration between the two states, some fifty or sixty years later (III and IV), looked back to this Rhodian judgement and reaffirmed it. The copies of the Roman decision on the matter, published in the same venue, in spite of the brevity of their reference, do provide the information that the Rhodian decision taken at this time favoured Priene.[2]

The earlier history of the dispute has been discussed already.[3] From the present inscription we learn that, prior to the judgement of Lysimachos, Alexander the Great may have been involved in some capacity in the conflict between Samos and Priene. The Prienian advocates who put their case before the later Rhodian court referred at one point to Alexander's expedition into Asia. The natural assumption is that he ruled on the dispute while he was in Asia, perhaps in favour of Priene.[4] The inscription also adds detail to our knowledge of the arbitration of Lysimachos, as noted in **26**. It seems that the judgement of Lysimachos in the 280s was accepted as final by both sides as regards the Batinetis as a whole. At that time it was given to Samos. The disagreement that was to be settled by the Rhodians in the second century was over the claim, not to the entire Batinetis, but to certain possessions within it, specifically the fortress of Karion and the land around it, called Dryoussa. The fortress was apparently not included in Lysimachos's grant of the land to Samos but rather remained at the time in Prienian hands. This may have laid the groundwork for further unsuccessful Samian attempts throughout the next century, perhaps through litigation, to add Karion and Dryoussa to its possession of the entire

2. See **160** for a full citation of the Roman decrees, which refer not only to the involvement of Rhodes in this conflict but also, at some time in the past, to that of one Antigonos. *IPriene* 38, included here (II), is a collection of fragments from the temple in the Rhodian dialect, which doubtless belong to the time of the Rhodian decision.

The temporal context of the Rhodian arbitration is probably the latter part of the 190s. It should be no later than around 190 or so, since the arbitration of Manlius Vulso (**99**) in 188 overturned the Rhodian decision. A feasible upper terminus is provided by the extension of Rhodian protection over various Ptolemaic holdings, including Samos, at the end of the Second Macedonian War (Livy 33.20; see Shipley, p. 194). For Rhodes's frequent position as an arbitrator or mediator in the first decades of the second century, cf. **77**, **109**; and see Ager, *Historia* 40.

3. See **26**; Hicks, *BMus* III.1, pp. 1–5; Piccirilli 4, 22.

4. I, lines 146–47: Ἀλεξάνδρου διαβάντος εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν ἐνέμον|[το]. If Alexander did involve himself as a judge in this conflict, he may have done so either in 334, when he was making his way down the coast of Asia Minor (see A. J. Heisserer, *Alexander the Great and the Greeks* [Norman, Okla., 1980] p. 160), or perhaps in 324/3. In the wake of the exiles decree, which would have entailed the return of the Samians to the homeland from which they had been absent since 361, the dispute might have flared up again, and both sides might have agreed to refer it to Alexander when he was hearing the various embassies at Babylon in 323 (**7**).

Batinetis. At the time of the judgement of Lysimachos, so the Prienians claimed, the Samians had admitted that Karion belonged to Priene, and they had made no attempt to dispute this or to include Karion in the Samian claim (I, lines 128–31). But several years afterwards, during the reign of Antiochos II Theos (I, line 132), the Samians, having fallen on hard times, decided that they did wish to dispute the Prienian presence in the Batinetis, charging them with encroachment. In previous decades the Prienian holders of Karion had spread out into Samian-controlled territory, inspiring private trespassing suits, but no public charges against the state of Priene had been invoked, despite the fact that the Samians had the opportunity to do so during the tribunal of Lysimachos. At some point perhaps in the 250s, however, the Samians decided to make a public case of the trespassing issue. But according to the Prienian story, at any rate, the Samians still said nothing of the Prienian tenure of Karion, thereby implicitly acquiescing in it. It may be that the Samians turned to King Antiochos for an arbitration as both sides had turned to monarchs in the past (I, lines 131f.); but this is a tentative interpretation of a very fragmented portion of the inscription.

The conflict between Samos and Priene over the mainland territory evidently continued through the period of the Third Syrian War. Perhaps at that time a royal commissioner, an *epistates* by the name of Simon, was sent to them in an attempt to settle it (I, lines 134–35). Clearly, however, this was an eternal dispute, and both sides took advantage of any changes in the power structure of the empires of the time. Hence, when Antigonos III Doson arrived in Asia Minor on his mysterious Carian expedition, one of his tasks was to take a hand in the ongoing struggle over the Batinetis. The issue still seems to have been one of continual trespass and gradual encroachment, implying that the region continued to be shared by both parties.[5] Antigonos's name appears over the course of several lines in the summary of the Prienian evidence.[6] This and the fact that an Antigonos also appears in the Roman *senatus consultum* from the later second century suggest that an Antigonid decision in the matter, whatever it was, was significant and influential. Both Seleukids and Antigonids, then, as well as Lysimachos and Alexander, seem to have had a hand in settling the Priene-Samos problem. To round out the roster of Hellenistic powers, we should expect that the Ptolemies would also have been involved at some point. In fact, there is a reference, not to the direct involvement of a Ptolemaic monarch,

5. Lines 137f.; for the identification of "Antigonos" with Antigonos III on his Carian expedition see *IPriene,* p. 42 (but cf., on the contrary, *IPriene,* "Nachträge"); Will, vol. 1, pp. 370–71; and Bengtson.

6. Of course there is no guarantee that each reference signifies the same Antigonos. Alexander's name appears in the midst of these lines, a fact that suggests that the summary of the evidence, in the fragmented form in which we have it, does not maintain a simple chronological order.

but to a Ptolemaic officer, one Antiochos, who was perhaps stationed in the region (I, line 153). Nothing is said of his actions, but, like the other individuals mentioned in the course of the evidence, he probably intervened in some judicial capacity in the dispute.

The Rhodian inscription opens with the list of the five arbitrators who were to judge or mediate in the case, men named by the people of Rhodes, the state upon which both of the litigants had agreed. At least two of the individuals who acted as arbitrators here were chosen for their ability, since they are found elsewhere acting in similar capacities. Nikostratos acted as an arbitrator in arranging the treaty between Miletos and Magnesia, perhaps in the 180s (**109**). Euphaniskos is named as a Delphian *proxenos* in the year 180/79, and he acted as one of the arbitrators in a dispute between Delphi and Amphissa around that time (**117**). We may conclude that in addition to developing a general international reputation as a mediator/arbitrator, Rhodes could also provide certain individuals who might have developed a specialized skill in the field. These men would be familiar with regular judicial procedures and rules of evidence, as in this case, where part of their task was to assess the quality of the written testimony they were offered. But they would also be skilled mediators; the judges' original mandate was either to give a judgement or to bring about a reconciliation (I, lines 12–13). In the end, however, a settlement was reached only through a judicial decision, an arbitration in the strict sense of the term (I, lines 24–27).

Unlike some other arbitration inscriptions, this lengthy Rhodian document does not appear to include a copy of the original agreement to go to arbitration, the *compromissum*.[7] Instead, we must deduce some of the aspects of that agreement from the Rhodian account of how the arbitration was carried out. The chief value of *IPriene* 37 as an arbitration document is the extraordinary detail and attention paid to the evidence in the case. References to actual procedure are in fact scantier than in some other inscriptions.[8] Nevertheless, certain facts about the original agreement and the procedure of the trial can be uncovered. The list of the advocates from both states was given, although only the names of the Prienians survive.[9] The fact that there were five advocates from Priene suggests that there was probably the same number from Samos.[10] The original agreement probably laid down the rules for the hearing of evidence and the

7. See **153**, **164**.

8. See **21**, **129**.

9. It is interesting to note that some of the Prienian advocates were probably also judicial experts. Metrodoros and Kallikrates acted as foreign judges themselves, in Bargylia (Metrodoros, *IPriene* 47) and Iasos (Kallikrates, *IPriene* 54). As for Apollodoros, he was involved in the settlement of a dispute between Phokaia and Smyrna (**91**).

10. This was not an invariable rule. When the agreement between Sardis and Ephesos was mediated by Pergamon, Sardis was represented by three of its citizens, Ephesos by seven of its (**170**).

pleas of the advocates. Certainly it would have provided for the multiple venues of the trial that we read about in the final copy of the Rhodian judgement. The Samians and Prienians had numerous chances to argue their case: first in the precinct of Dionysos at Rhodes, then during a survey of the disputed land, including Karion, where each side had the chance to escort the Rhodian tribunal, and finally at Ephesos in the temple of Artemis.[11] The sacred venue for a trial is not unprecedented; aside from Athenian practice in homicide trials, it was apparently part of the agreement between the cities of the Lesbian *koinon* that disputes between them should be heard in a federal sanctuary (**92**).

The disputants were obviously given multiple opportunities to argue their case, both within a formal trial setting and during a tour of the disputed territory. The phrasing of the inscription suggests that separate tours were given by each side to the Rhodian judges, as was the case when Boumelita and Halai requested the arbitration of Thebes (**129**). Separate tours ensured that the judges could listen to each side's argument at least once in a nonconfrontational environment. Since they had visited the land personally, the judges could declare in their résumé that they made their final decision based on autopsy. That decision was that Karion and Dryoussa were to remain in the possession of Priene, and a letter was sent to each of the two litigants informing them of this judgement (lines 24–44).

The bulk of the inscription is taken up with recitals of the evidence adduced by either side, presumably for the purpose of justifying the final judgement that the Rhodians made. The first section of evidence (lines 44–63), although very fragmented, appears to have been the Samian claim. The Samian advocates referred to ancient history and cited specifically the historian Maiandrios of Miletos in an attempt to establish the priority of their claim, not just to the Batinetis but also to Karion and Dryoussa. The Prienian argument that follows (lines 63–90) also offered a fragment of the history, much more recent, of Karion. The Prienians referred to a period of tyranny at the end of the fourth century, under Hieron, and they were able to prove that during and after this tyranny the citizens of Priene held Karion. The Prienians listed a number of public documents and decrees in support of their contentions. While it may be unfair to make a comparison, given the poor condition of the stone in the place where the Samian argument had been inscribed, it seems that the Samians had far less in the way of contemporary documentary evidence to offer.[12]

11. I, lines 20–24. Perhaps certain documentary evidence relevant to the case of Samos and Priene had been deposited in the nearby state of Ephesos. On the survey of the district in question by the judges in the case of a boundary dispute, cf. **38**, **118**, **129**, **146** et al.

12. The fact that the Prienians appear to have been in possession of Karion at a much more recent date might seem to support the strength of their own claim; however, it was often the priority of one's claim, rather than the status quo of possession, which would be adduced as the juster cause in a case like this. This is what the Samians argue.

The next statement of the Samians (lines 90–96) is also extremely fragmented; a few phrases survive that suggest that they accused the Prienians, perhaps in response to the historical evidence dating from the time of the Prienian tyranny, of having taken the fortress from them.[13] A representation to Lysimachos is mentioned, which must refer to the judgement of Lysimachos around 283; perhaps the Samians tried to use his favourable verdict to strengthen their own arguments.[14] There is a large lacuna, some seventeen or eighteen lines, following these phrases; here would have stood the conclusion of this Samian evidence, and the opening of the next stage of Prienian evidence (lines 97–118, or perhaps only 97–101). All that is left of the Prienian claim is their statement that while certain complaints had been lodged by Samos about individual cases of private trespass,[15] the Samians had not availed themselves of the opportunity to make a case about Karion; at least not until now. The next section (lines 101f.) appears to be a reversion to the Samian claims, as summarized by the Rhodians. They again referred to the evidence of the historians, and the previous award of the Batinetis, trying to show that Karion and Dryoussa had after all been theirs from the time of the Melian War. Here they definitely accuse the Prienians of taking the fortress from them at the time of the tyranny of Hieron, and keeping it until the present.

The extensive use of the literary works of historians in this case is interesting. In the Hellenistic period, a time when the number of local histories was increasing, it is scarcely surprising that such works should be employed as evidence for the past history of a piece of territory, and as an aid in determining its present boundaries. In addition to Maiandrios of Miletos, the Samians cited several other historians, among them the Samians Euagon, Olympichos, and Douris.[16] The Samian advocates interpreted the evidence of these authors as favourable to their case, saying that they proved that the Prienians had seized Karion (unjustly) at the time of Hieron's tyranny and refused to give it up. In the justification of their decision (I, lines 118–57), the Rhodians gave their judgement on the value of the Samian evidence. Since the Samians had relied on ancient history and the historians for much of their argument, it was incumbent on the Rhodians to evaluate these writers objectively. It is difficult to see why the

13. Cf. lines 109–10. There is no notion in the Prienian evidence that when the fugitive citizens occupied Karion when Hieron became tyrant they were taking it from the *Samians*. Hicks (*BMus* III.1, p. 3) suggests possible collusion between the Samians and the tyrant of Priene.

14. If so, they may have weakened their own case by mentioning this award; as the Prienians later apparently pointed out (lines 130–31), Samos did *not* claim Karion and Dryoussa in 283.

15. On παρορία, cf. **120**.

16. On the use of historians and other writers for evidence, cf. **26**, **146**, **158**; and see Curty. For the various historians cited in this inscription see Jacoby, *FGH* 76 (Douris), 115 (Theopompos), 417 (Kreophylos), 418 (Eualkes), 491 (Maiandrios), 535 (Euagon), 538 (Ouliades), 537 (Olympichos).

Samians would have chosen the evidence of some of these historians, as the Rhodians determined that all of them, except Maiandrios, whose writings were suspect anyway, apparently had nothing to say of an ancient Samian claim to Karion and Dryoussa, granting Samos only the town of Phygela or Pygela.[17]

The Rhodians then went on to review the claims of Priene (lines 124–57) and affirmed that it had been awarded Karion and Dryoussa a century before. It is in these fragmented lines that we find the record of the checkered history of this territory throughout the late fourth and third centuries. Having spent much time in summarizing the arguments of both sides, presumably in the interests of justifying their own decision, the Rhodians then repeated the judgement that they had announced at the beginning of the inscription, that the fortress and the land around it were to remain a Prienian possession. But this is still not the end of *IPriene* 37. The rest of it (lines 158ff.) deals with an exact termination of the boundaries of the land in question, even to the extent of noting specific places for the placing of boundary markers.[18]

75. The Achaian League and Athens mediate between the Boiotians and Flamininus (196)

Livy 33.29.7–12.

Matthaei, *CQ*, pp. 259–60; Ferguson, *Athens*, p. 279; Walbank, *Philip V*, p. 178; id., *Comm*, vol. 2, pp. 608–9; Larsen, *GFS*, p. 400; Briscoe, *Books XXXI–XXXIII*, pp. 300f.; Gruen, pp. 117, 449; Eckstein, *Senate and General*, pp. 297f.; id., *Historia* 37 (1988) p. 421.

> Quinctius primo noxios tradi sibi iussit et pro quingentis militibus—tot enim interempti erant—quingenta talenta Boeotos conferre. (8) quorum neutrum cum fieret, verbis tantum civitates excusarent nihil publico consilio factum esse, missis Athenas et in Achaiam legatis, qui testarentur socios iusto pioque se bello persecuturum Boeotos, (9) et cum parte copiarum Ap. Claudio Acraephiam ire iusso ipse cum parte Coroneam circumsidit vastatis prius agris qua ab Elatia duo diversa agmina iere. (10) hac perculsi clade Boeoti, cum omnia terrore ac fuga completa essent, legatos mittunt. qui cum in castra non admitterentur Achaei Atheniensesque supervenerunt. (11) plus auctoritatis Achaei habuerunt deprecantes quia, ni impetrassent pacem Boeotis bellum simul gerere decreverant. (12) per Achaeos et Boeotis copia adeundi adloquendique Romanum facta est iussisque tradere noxios et multae nomine triginta conferre talenta pax data et ab oppugnatione recessum.

17. This in spite of the fact, as the Rhodians point out, that four of the historians themselves were Samians.

18. Cf. **109**, lines 34–36.

Samians would have chosen the evidence of some of these historians, as the Rhodians determined that all of them, except Maiandrios, whose writings were suspect anyway, apparently had nothing to say of an ancient Samian claim to Karion and Dryoussa, granting Samos only the town of Phygela or Pygela.[17]

The Rhodians then went on to review the claims of Priene (lines 124–57) and affirmed that it had been awarded Karion and Dryoussa a century before. It is in these fragmented lines that we find the record of the checkered history of this territory throughout the late fourth and third centuries. Having spent much time in summarizing the arguments of both sides, presumably in the interests of justifying their own decision, the Rhodians then repeated the judgement that they had announced at the beginning of the inscription, that the fortress and the land around it were to remain a Prienian possession. But this is still not the end of *IPriene* 37. The rest of it (lines 158ff.) deals with an exact termination of the boundaries of the land in question, even to the extent of noting specific places for the placing of boundary markers.[18]

75. The Achaian League and Athens mediate between the Boiotians and Flamininus (196)

Livy 33.29.7–12.

Matthaei, *CQ*, pp. 259–60; Ferguson, *Athens*, p. 279; Walbank, *Philip V*, p. 178; id., *Comm*, vol. 2, pp. 608–9; Larsen, *GFS*, p. 400; Briscoe, *Books XXXI–XXXIII*, pp. 300f.; Gruen, pp. 117, 449; Eckstein, *Senate and General*, pp. 297f.; id., *Historia* 37 (1988) p. 421.

> Quinctius primo noxios tradi sibi iussit et pro quingentis militibus—tot enim interempti erant—quingenta talenta Boeotos conferre. (8) quorum neutrum cum fieret, verbis tantum civitates excusarent nihil publico consilio factum esse, missis Athenas et in Achaiam legatis, qui testarentur socios iusto pioque se bello persecuturum Boeotos, (9) et cum parte copiarum Ap. Claudio Acraephiam ire iusso ipse cum parte Coroneam circumsidit vastatis prius agris qua ab Elatia duo diversa agmina iere. (10) hac perculsi clade Boeoti, cum omnia terrore ac fuga completa essent, legatos mittunt. qui cum in castra non admitterentur Achaei Atheniensesque supervenerunt. (11) plus auctoritatis Achaei habuerunt deprecantes quia, ni impetrassent pacem Boeotis bellum simul gerere decreverant. (12) per Achaeos et Boeotis copia adeundi adloquendique Romanum facta est iussisque tradere noxios et multae nomine triginta conferre talenta pax data et ab oppugnatione recessum.

17. This in spite of the fact, as the Rhodians point out, that four of the historians themselves were Samians.

18. Cf. **109**, lines 34–36.

In the winter after Kynoskephalai (197/6), Flamininus became entangled in a widespread wave of anti-Roman violence in Boiotia. Several Roman soldiers were waylaid and murdered. Livy's account of five hundred deaths may be exaggerated, but the threat became so serious that Flamininus was obliged to step in. The Roman commander chose to treat these actions as officially sanctioned by the Boiotian state. He demanded reparation from the League, to the tune of 500 talents, in addition to requiring the surrender of the guilty parties. When the League obeyed neither order, claiming reasonably enough (if undiplomatically) that the state had not sanctioned these acts of violence, Flamininus prepared to invade Boiotia. Before doing so, however, he called the allies of Rome to witness that he was waging a *iustum bellum*, sending ambassadors to Athens and Achaia for this purpose. Flamininus and Appius Claudius then moved the Roman forces into Boiotian territory.

The Boiotians had not committed an act of war against Rome. Whether or not the acts of violence against Romans had received secret approbation from pro-Macedonian Boiotian politicians was immaterial. Technically the Boiotian League was perfectly justified in claiming that it was not responsible for criminal acts by outlaws. Flamininus probably realized this, and his embassies to Athens and the Achaians may have provoked exactly the response he wanted. He had achieved the desired effect of frightening the Boiotians by devastating their territory and refusing to receive their ambassadors; but the arrival of Athenian and Achaian ambassadors, bent on mediating a settlement between the Romans and the Boiotians, allowed him to come to a peaceful arrangement with a government that might be expected to be more circumspect in the future. The Achaians in particular had influence, and it was through them that the Boiotians gained the opportunity to meet with Flamininus. This time the indemnity they were required to pay was more reasonable: a mere 30 talents (of course we have no idea of the value of the property destroyed by the Romans in their brief invasion of the country).

76. The Roman settlement of Greece after the Second Macedonian War (196)

I: Polybios 18.42.5–7.
II: Polybios 18.47.5–13.
III: Livy 33.34.5–11.
IV: Plutarch *Flamininus* 12.2–3.

Walbank, *Philip V*, pp. 179f.; Roebuck, Diss., pp. 90f.; Walbank, *Comm.* vol. 2, pp. 604f.; Errington, *Dawn*, pp. 153f.; Briscoe, *Books XXXI-XXXIII*, pp. 313f.; Gruen, pp. 103, 448–49; Bastini, pp. 54f.; Eckstein, *Senate and General*, pp. 290f.

In the winter after Kynoskephalai (197/6), Flamininus became entangled in a widespread wave of anti-Roman violence in Boiotia. Several Roman soldiers were waylaid and murdered. Livy's account of five hundred deaths may be exaggerated, but the threat became so serious that Flamininus was obliged to step in. The Roman commander chose to treat these actions as officially sanctioned by the Boiotian state. He demanded reparation from the League, to the tune of 500 talents, in addition to requiring the surrender of the guilty parties. When the League obeyed neither order, claiming reasonably enough (if undiplomatically) that the state had not sanctioned these acts of violence, Flamininus prepared to invade Boiotia. Before doing so, however, he called the allies of Rome to witness that he was waging a *iustum bellum*, sending ambassadors to Athens and Achaia for this purpose. Flamininus and Appius Claudius then moved the Roman forces into Boiotian territory.

The Boiotians had not committed an act of war against Rome. Whether or not the acts of violence against Romans had received secret approbation from pro-Macedonian Boiotian politicians was immaterial. Technically the Boiotian League was perfectly justified in claiming that it was not responsible for criminal acts by outlaws. Flamininus probably realized this, and his embassies to Athens and the Achaians may have provoked exactly the response he wanted. He had achieved the desired effect of frightening the Boiotians by devastating their territory and refusing to receive their ambassadors; but the arrival of Athenian and Achaian ambassadors, bent on mediating a settlement between the Romans and the Boiotians, allowed him to come to a peaceful arrangement with a government that might be expected to be more circumspect in the future. The Achaians in particular had influence, and it was through them that the Boiotians gained the opportunity to meet with Flamininus. This time the indemnity they were required to pay was more reasonable: a mere 30 talents (of course we have no idea of the value of the property destroyed by the Romans in their brief invasion of the country).

76. The Roman settlement of Greece after the Second Macedonian War (196)

I: Polybios 18.42.5–7.
II: Polybios 18.47.5–13.
III: Livy 33.34.5–11.
IV: Plutarch *Flamininus* 12.2–3.

Walbank, *Philip V*, pp. 179f.; Roebuck, Diss., pp. 90f.; Walbank, *Comm.* vol. 2, pp. 604f.; Errington, *Dawn*, pp. 153f.; Briscoe, *Books XXXI-XXXIII*, pp. 313f.; Gruen, pp. 103, 448–49; Bastini, pp. 54f.; Eckstein, *Senate and General*, pp. 290f.

I: Polybios 18.42.5–7

Ὧν ἐπιτελεσθεισῶν εὐθέως ἡ σύγκλητος ἄνδρας δέκα καταστήσασα τῶν ἐπιφανῶν ἐξέπεμπε τοὺς χειριοῦντας τὰ κατὰ τὴν Ἑλλάδα μετὰ τοῦ Τίτου καὶ βεβαιώσοντας τοῖς Ἕλλησι τὴν ἐλευθερίαν. (6) ἐποιήσαντο δὲ λόγους ἐν τῇ συγκλήτῳ καὶ περὶ τῆς συμμαχίας οἱ παρὰ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν πρέσβεις, οἱ περὶ Δαμόξενον τὸν Αἰγιέα· (7) γενομένης δ' ἀντιρρήσεως κατὰ τὸ παρὸν διὰ τὸ κατὰ πρόσωπον Ἠλείους μὲν ἀμφισβητεῖν τοῖς Ἀχαιοῖς ὑπὲρ τῆς Τριφυλίας, Μεσσηνίους δ' ὑπὲρ Ἀσίνης καὶ Πύλου, συμμάχους τότε Ῥωμαίων ὑπάρχοντας, Αἰτωλοὺς δὲ περὶ τῆς Ἡραιῶν πόλεως, ὑπέρθεσιν ἔλαβε τὸ διαβούλιον ἐπὶ τοὺς δέκα.

II: Polybios 18.47.5–13

Μετὰ δὲ τούτους εἰσεκαλοῦντο πάντας τοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν καὶ πόλεων παραγεγονότας, καὶ τὰ δόξαντα τῷ συνεδρίῳ διεσάφουν. (6) Μακεδόνων μὲν οὖν τοὺς Ὀρέστας καλουμένους διὰ τὸ προσχωρῆσαι σφίσι κατὰ τὸν πόλεμον αὐτονόμους ἀφεῖσαν, ἠλευθέρωσαν δὲ Περραιβοὺς καὶ Δόλοπας καὶ Μάγνητας. (7) Θετταλοῖς δὲ μετὰ τῆς ἐλευθερίας καὶ τοὺς Ἀχαιοὺς τοὺς Φθιώτας προσένειμαν, ἀφελόμενοι Θήβας τὰς Φθίας καὶ Φάρσαλον· (8) οἱ γὰρ Αἰτωλοὶ περί τε τῆς Φαρσάλου μεγάλην ἐποιοῦντο φιλοτιμίαν, φάσκοντες αὑτῶν δεῖν ὑπάρχειν κατὰ τὰς ἐξ ἀρχῆς συνθήκας, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ περὶ Λευκάδος. (9) οἱ δ' ἐν τῷ συνεδρίῳ περὶ μὲν τούτων τῶν πόλεων ὑπερέθεντο τοῖς Αἰτωλοῖς τὸ διαβούλιον πάλιν ἐπὶ τὴν σύγκλητον, τοὺς δὲ Φωκέας καὶ τοὺς Λοκροὺς συνεχώρησαν αὐτοῖς ἔχειν, καθάπερ εἶχον καὶ πρότερον, ἐν τῇ συμπολιτείᾳ. (10) Κόρινθον δὲ καὶ τὴν Τριφυλίαν καὶ ⟨τὴν Ἡραιῶν πόλιν Ἀχαιοῖς ἀπέδωκαν. Ὠρεὸν δ'⟩, ἔτι δὲ τὴν Ἐρετριέων πόλιν ἐδόκει μὲν τοῖς πλείοσιν Εὐμένει δοῦναι· (11) Τίτου δὲ πρὸς τὸ συνέδριον διαστείλαντος οὐκ ἐκυρώθη τὸ διαβούλιον· διὸ καὶ μετά τινα χρόνον ἠλευθερώθησαν αἱ πόλεις αὗται διὰ τῆς συγκλήτου καὶ σὺν ταύταις Κάρυστος. (12) ἔδωκαν δὲ καὶ Πλευράτῳ Λυχνίδα καὶ Πάρθον, οὔσας μὲν Ἰλλυρίδας, ὑπὸ Φίλιππον δὲ τατταμένας. (13) Ἀμυνάνδρῳ δὲ συνεχώρησαν, ὅσα παρεσπάσατο κατὰ πόλεμον ἐρύματα τοῦ Φιλίππου, κρατεῖν τούτων.

III: Livy 33.34.5–11

Dimissis regis legatis conventus civitatum gentiumque est haberi coeptus; eoque maturius peragebatur, quod decreta decem legatorum in civitates nominatim pronuntiabantur. (6) Orestis—Macedonum ea gens est—quod primi ab rege defecissent, suae leges redditae. Magnetes et Perrhaebi et Dolopes liberi quoque pronuntiati. (7) Thessalorum genti praeter libertatem concessam Achaei Phthiotae dati, Thebis Phthioticis et Pharsalo excepta. Aetolos de Pharsalo et Leucade postulantes ut ex foedere sibi restituerentur ad senatum reiecerunt. (8) Phocenses Locrensesque, sicut ante fuerant, adiecta decreti auctoritate iis contribuerunt. (9) Corinthus et Triphylia et Heraea—Peloponnesi et ipsa urbs est—reddita Achaeis. (10) Oreum et Eretriam decem legati Eumeni regi, Attali filio, dabant dissentiente Quinctio; ea una res in arbitrium senatus reiecta est; senatus libertatem his civitat-

ibus dedit Carysto adiecta. (11) Pleurato Lychnidus et Parthini dati; Illyriorum utraque gens sub dicione Philippi fuerant. Amynandrum tenere iusserunt castella quae per belli tempus Philippo capta ademisset.

IV: Plutarch *Flamininus* 12.2–3

Αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Τίτος εἰς Χαλκίδα παρελθών, εἶτα πλεύσας ἐκεῖθεν ἐπὶ Μαγνησίαν, ἐξῆγε τὰς φρουρὰς καὶ τὰς πολιτείας ἀπεδίδου τοῖς δήμοις. ἀγωνοθέτης δὲ Νεμείων ἀποδειχθεὶς ἐν Ἄργει τήν τε πανήγυριν ἄριστα διέθηκε, καὶ πάλιν ἐκεῖ τοῖς Ἕλλησι τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ὑπὸ κήρυκος ἀνεῖπεν. (3) ἐπιφοιτῶν τε ταῖς πόλεσιν εὐνομίαν ἅμα καὶ δίκην πολλὴν ὁμόνοιάν τε καὶ φιλοφροσύνην πρὸς ἀλλήλους παρεῖχε, καταπαύων μὲν τὰς στάσεις, κατάγων δὲ τὰς φυγάς, ἀγαλλόμενος δὲ τῷ πείθειν καὶ διαλλάσσειν τοὺς Ἕλληνας οὐχ ἧττον ἢ τῷ κεχρατηκέναι τῶν Μακεδόνων, ὥστε μικρότατον ἤδη τὴν ἐλευθερίαν δοκεῖν ὧν εὐεργετοῦντο.

The famous "declaration at the Isthmos" in the aftermath of the Second Macedonian War had its roots in Roman policies of self-interest, not in disinterested philhellenism. The most advantageous course for Rome in these years was to reinforce pro-Roman feeling in order to secure Greece from the increasing influence of Antiochos the Great. Much of the country was in turmoil after the war and the liberation from Macedonian domination. There were many local decisions of lesser significance to be made, decisions that constituted part of the work of the decemvirate sent out to join Flamininus. It was in these labours that we might expect to find evidence of local arbitrations between the Greek states.

In part, evidence for arbitrations at the time of the settlement of Greece in 196 may be adduced from the later inscription recording a series of arbitrations between two towns in Achaia Phthiotis (**156**). This region was confirmed as the property of the liberated Thessalians after the war. Two of its towns, Melitaia and Narthakion, had a long-standing border dispute. According to the inscription, the dispute was settled in the wake of the work of the Roman decemvirate in accordance with the laws of the Thessalians as established by Flamininus.[1] The nature of the evidence here is analogous to the case of Priene and Samos. There, the inscription recording an arbitration between these two by Rome's representatives in Asia Minor after Apameia is a surviving epigraphic example of many arbitrations we know from the literary sources to have taken place at that time. Here, the document concerning Melitaia and Narthakion is probably indicative of still more instances of arbitration for which we happen to have no epigraphic evidence.[2] There is more significant evidence in the literary sources for Rome adjudicating territorial disputes after the Second Macedonian War. Polybios, and Livy in following him, wrote of the territorial adjustments

1. See the discussion in **79**.
2. On Samos and Priene, see **100**, **101**, **160**.

made after the war. After Kynoskephalai, and the peace granted to Philip by Flamininus, the final peace had to be ratified by the senate. Along with ambassadors sent by Philip and legates sent by Flamininus, representatives of the Greek states also visited Rome at this time (Polyb.18.42.1). Their concern was to get in the first claim on territories they felt they could persuade the Romans to adjust in their favour. In particular, Rome's new friend, the Achaian League, in addition to pressing Rome for a formal alliance, wanted Rome to recognize its claim to territories in the Peloponnese: Triphylia, Asine, Pylos, and Heraia. But there were counterclaims: Elis, Rome's ally, wanted Triphylia back, and Messene, also Rome's ally, wanted Asine and Pylos, while the Aitolians laid claim to Heraia.[3] This may well be the first instance of embassies from the states of Greece attempting to exploit the Roman senate as an arbitral tribunal. The pattern was being set for the future as Greek ambassadors brought their claims to Rome and tried to argue their cases before the senate as though it was a court of arbitrators.[4] The senate, however, did not always give full attention to these claims. In 196, as so often in later years, the senators shelved their own discussion of these matters and passed on the decision to others, this time to the decemvirate that was to join Flamininus.

It was after the Isthmia of 196 that the Roman legates announced their findings on the conflicting territorial claims of the Greeks. In general, they supported the interests of those states that would prove or had proved themselves to be most beneficial to Rome. Whatever the validity of the claims of Elis and Messene, these were relatively insignificant states and, although allied to Rome, had done nothing to help Rome in the Second Macedonian War. Rome was more interested in pursuing its new friendship with Achaia and confirmed the League's ownership of Triphylia, Asine, and Pylos.[5] Heraia was also recognized as Achaian, in spite of Aitolia's claim. But Aitolia did receive some of what it had claimed. Heraia was lost to Aitolia, but the Romans approved Aitolia's

3. Cf. Livy 28.8.6, 32.5.4–5. Philip had taken Triphylia from Elis during the Social War, promised it to Achaia in 208, and handed it over in 199/8; at the time he may have adjudicated rival claims of Megalopolis and the Achaian League to the town of Alipheira. Asine had been taken by Achaia, perhaps by 209, and Pylos was an Achaian possession by 220. The conflicting claims to Heraia present a problem. It too had been promised to Achaia by Philip in 208 and delivered in 199/8. But on what did the Aitolians base their claim to possession? Aymard (*PR*, pp. 25–27) argues that they based their claim on a possible brief tenure during the First Macedonian War; he conjectures that they captured it, only to have Philip recapture it sometime before 208. See Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 2, p. 607, and *Philip V*, p. 17, for objections to this. It may be that Philip had promised it to Aitolia in the peace agreement of 206; or Aitolia's claim may date to farther back in the third century, before the Achaians first acquired it in 236/5. See Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 2, pp. 607–8; Briscoe, pp. 174–75; Roebuck, Diss., p. 90.

4. Cf. **78**, **101**, **106**, **111**, **156**, **160**.

5. See Roebuck, Diss., pp. 90–91. Asine and Pylos are not specified separately, but it seems likely that they, like the other Achaian claims, were now recognized as Achaian.

possession of Dolopia, Phokis, Lokris, and Phthiotic Thebes. In addition, the decemvirate appears to have taken very seriously the legality of the Aitolian claim to Pharsalos and Leukas. The issue of the ownership of these two places was actually referred back to the senate for adjudication. The Aitolians might have had cause for hope in this, and they sent an embassy to Rome in order to argue their case. This hope, however, was short-lived. The senate appears to have had no notion of dealing with the issue as a neutral arbitrator would deal with a question of legal ownership to be settled. In the following year, 195, in the face of deteriorating relations with Aitolia, the senate referred Aitolia's request for adjudication of its claim to Pharsalos and Leukas back to Flamininus (Livy 33.49).

77. The conference at Lysimacheia between Roman legates and Antiochos III (Fall 196)

I: Polybios 18.49.2–50.5.
II: Polybios 18.51.10–52.3.
III: Livy 33.39.1–4.
IV: Livy 33.40.3.
V: Appian *Syriaca* 2.

Cf. Diodoros 28.12.

H. van Gelder, *Geschichte der alten Rhodier* (The Hague, 1900) p. 132; Badian, *FC*, pp. 75–76; id., *CPh* 54 (1959) pp. 81–99; Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 2, pp. 620–23; Errington, *Dawn*, pp. 159–60; Klose, p. 144; H. R. Rawlings, *AJAH* 1 (1976) pp. 8f., 15f.; Will, vol. 2, pp. 185–89; Gruen, pp. 103, 541–43; Berthold, pp. 147–48; Mehl, pp. 148–52; Ager, *Historia* 40 (1991) pp. 23–24.

I: Polybios 18.49.2–50.5

Ὅτι προχωρούσης τῷ Ἀντιόχῳ κατὰ νοῦν τῆς ἐπιβολῆς παρόντι ἐν Θράκῃ τῷ Ἀντιόχῳ κατέπλευσαν εἰς Σηλυβρίαν οἱ περὶ Λεύκιον Κορνήλιον. (3) οὗτοι δ' ἦσαν παρὰ τῆς συγκλήτου πρέσβεις ἐπὶ τὰς διαλύσεις ἐξαπεσταλμένοι τὰς Ἀντιόχου καὶ Πτολεμαίου. [50] κατὰ δὲ τὸν αὐτὸν καιρὸν ἦκον καὶ τῶν δέκα Πόπλιος μὲν Λέντλος ἐκ Βαργυλίων, (2) Λεύκιος δὲ Τερέντιος καὶ Πόπλιος Οὐίλλιος ἐκ Θάσου. (3) ταχὺ δὲ τῷ βασιλεῖ διασαφηθείσης τῆς τούτων παρουσίας, πάντες ἐν ὀλίγαις ἡμέραις ἠθροίσθησαν εἰς τὴν Λυσιμάχειαν. (4) συνεκύρησαν δὲ καὶ οἱ περὶ τὸν Ἡγησιάναχτα καὶ Λυσίαν οἱ πρὸς τὸν Τίτον ἀποσταλέντες εἰς τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον. αἱ μὲν οὖν κατ' ἰδίαν ἐντεύξεις τοῦ τε βασιλέως καὶ τῶν Ῥωμαίων τελέως ἦσαν ἀφελεῖς καὶ φιλάνθρωποι· (5) μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα γενομένης συνεδρείας κοινῆς ὑπὲρ τῶν ὅλων ἀλλοιοτέραν ἔλαβε τὰ πράγματα διάθεσιν. ὁ γὰρ Λεύκιος ὁ Κορνήλιος ἠξίου μὲν καὶ τῶν ὑπὸ Πτολεμαῖον ταττομένων πόλεων.

possession of Dolopia, Phokis, Lokris, and Phthiotic Thebes. In addition, the decemvirate appears to have taken very seriously the legality of the Aitolian claim to Pharsalos and Leukas. The issue of the ownership of these two places was actually referred back to the senate for adjudication. The Aitolians might have had cause for hope in this, and they sent an embassy to Rome in order to argue their case. This hope, however, was short-lived. The senate appears to have had no notion of dealing with the issue as a neutral arbitrator would deal with a question of legal ownership to be settled. In the following year, 195, in the face of deteriorating relations with Aitolia, the senate referred Aitolia's request for adjudication of its claim to Pharsalos and Leukas back to Flamininus (Livy 33.49).

77. The conference at Lysimacheia between Roman legates and Antiochos III (Fall 196)

I: Polybios 18.49.2–50.5.
II: Polybios 18.51.10–52.3.
III: Livy 33.39.1–4.
IV: Livy 33.40.3.
V: Appian *Syriaca* 2.

Cf. Diodoros 28.12.

H. van Gelder, *Geschichte der alten Rhodier* (The Hague, 1900) p. 132; Badian, *FC*, pp. 75–76; id., *CPh* 54 (1959) pp. 81–99; Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 2, pp. 620–23; Errington, *Dawn*, pp. 159–60; Klose, p. 144; H. R. Rawlings, *AJAH* 1 (1976) pp. 8f., 15f.; Will, vol. 2, pp. 185–89; Gruen, pp. 103, 541–43; Berthold, pp. 147–48; Mehl, pp. 148–52; Ager, *Historia* 40 (1991) pp. 23–24.

I: Polybios 18.49.2–50.5

Ὅτι προχωρούσης τῷ Ἀντιόχῳ κατὰ νοῦν τῆς ἐπιβολῆς παρόντι ἐν Θράκῃ τῷ Ἀντιόχῳ κατέπλευσαν εἰς Σηλυβρίαν οἱ περὶ Λεύκιον Κορνήλιον. (3) οὗτοι δ' ἦσαν παρὰ τῆς συγκλήτου πρέσβεις ἐπὶ τὰς διαλύσεις ἐξαπεσταλμένοι τὰς Ἀντιόχου καὶ Πτολεμαίου. [50] κατὰ δὲ τὸν αὐτὸν καιρὸν ἦκον καὶ τῶν δέκα Πόπλιος μὲν Λέντλος ἐκ Βαργυλίων, (2) Λεύκιος δὲ Τερέντιος καὶ Πόπλιος Οὐίλλιος ἐκ Θάσου. (3) ταχὺ δὲ τῷ βασιλεῖ διασαφηθείσης τῆς τούτων παρουσίας, πάντες ἐν ὀλίγαις ἡμέραις ἠθροίσθησαν εἰς τὴν Λυσιμάχειαν. (4) συνεκύρησαν δὲ καὶ οἱ περὶ τὸν Ἡγησιάναχτα καὶ Λυσίαν οἱ πρὸς τὸν Τίτον ἀποσταλέντες εἰς τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον. αἱ μὲν οὖν κατ' ἰδίαν ἐντεύξεις τοῦ τε βασιλέως καὶ τῶν Ῥωμαίων τελέως ἦσαν ἀφελεῖς καὶ φιλάνθρωποι· (5) μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα γενομένης συνεδρείας κοινῆς ὑπὲρ τῶν ὅλων ἀλλοιοτέραν ἔλαβε τὰ πράγματα διάθεσιν. ὁ γὰρ Λεύκιος ὁ Κορνήλιος ἠξίου μὲν καὶ τῶν ὑπὸ Πτολεμαῖον ταττομένων πόλεων.

II: Polybios 18.51.10–52.3

Τὰ δὲ πρὸς Πτολεμαῖον αὐτὸς ἔφη διεξάξειν εὐδοκουμένως ἐκείνῳ· κρίνειν γὰρ οὐ φιλίαν μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ μετὰ τῆς φιλίας ἀναγκαιότητα συντίθεσθαι πρὸς αὐτόν. [52] τῶν δὲ περὶ τὸν Λεύκιον οἰομένων δεῖν καλεῖσθαι τοὺς Λαμψακηνοὺς καὶ τοὺς Cμυρναίους καὶ δοῦναι λόγον αὐτοῖς, ἐγένετο τοῦτο. (2) παρῆσαν δὲ παρὰ μὲν Λαμψακηνῶν οἱ περὶ Παρμενίωνα καὶ Πυθόδωρον, παρὰ δὲ Cμυρναίων οἱ περὶ Κοίρανον. (3) ὧν μετὰ παρρησίας διαλεγομένων, δυσχεράνας ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐπὶ τῷ δοκεῖν λόγον ὑπέχειν ἐπὶ Ῥωμαίων τοῖς πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀμφισβητοῦσι, μεσολαβήσας τὸν Παρμενίωνα "παῦσαι" φησὶ "τῶν πολλῶν· οὐ γὰρ ἐπὶ Ῥωμαίων, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ Ῥοδίων ὑμῖν εὐδοκῶ διακριθῆναι περὶ τῶν ἀντιλεγομένων." καὶ τότε μὲν ἐπὶ τούτοις διέλυσαν τὸν cύλλογον, οὐδαμῶς εὐδοκήσαντες ἀλλήλοις.

III: Livy 33.39.1–4

Sub hoc tempus et L. Cornelius, missus ab senatu ad dirimenda inter Antiochum Ptolomaeumque reges certamina, Selymbriae substitit, (2) et decem legatorum P. Lentulus a Bargyliis, P. Villius et L. Terentius ab Thaso Lysimachiam petierunt. eodem et ab Selymbria L. Cornelius et ex Thracia paucos post dies Antiochus convenerunt. (3) primus congressus cum legatis et deinceps invitatio benigna et hospitalis fuit; ut de mandatis statuque praesenti Asiae agi coeptum est, animi exasperati sunt. (4) Romani omnia acta eius, ex quo tempore ab Syria classem solvisset, displicere senatui non dissimulabant restituique et Ptolomaeo omnes civitates quae dicionis eius fuissent aequum censebant.

IV: Livy 33.40.3

Quod ad Ptolomaeum attineat, cui ademptas civitates querantur, sibi cum Ptolomaeo et amicitiam esse, et id agere ut brevi etiam adfinitas iungatur.

V: Appian *Syriaca* 2

Ἀφίκοντο πρέcβεις ἐc Ῥώμην παρὰ Πτολεμαίου τοῦ φιλοπάτορος, αἰτιωμένου Cυρίαν τε καὶ Κιλικίαν Ἀντίοχον αὐτὸν ὑφελέcθαι. καὶ οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι τῆς ἀφορμῆς ἐπέβαινον ἄcμενοι, κατὰ καιρὸν cφίcι γενομένης, καὶ πρέcβεις ἐc τὸν Ἀντίοχον ἔcτελλον, οἳ λόγῳ μὲν ἔμελλον cυναλλάξειν Πτολεμαῖον Ἀντιόχῳ, ἔργῳ δὲ κατακκέψεcθαι τὴν ὁρμὴν Ἀντιόχου καὶ κωλύcειν ὅca δύναιντο.

The subject of arbitration was in the air when Roman envoys met with Antiochos the Great at Lysimacheia in the fall of 196. Part of the mandate of the legates who met with the king there was to mediate a settlement to the existing conflict between Antiochos and Ptolemy. This Roman "mediation," however, took the form of attempted dictation. The chief demand was that Antiochos retire from Ptolemaic possessions that he had acquired. But Antiochos surprised the legates by the pronouncement that he and Ptolemy had already reached an

agreement between themselves without Roman help. Not only had he and Ptolemy concluded peace; they had contracted a marriage alliance. Ptolemy had evidently given up hope of significant Roman support against Antiochos, despite the Roman propaganda efforts of 200.

The Lysimacheia conference also dealt with disputes between Antiochos and certain of the Greek states of Asia. In the late fall or winter of 197/6 Antiochos had been extending his rule over the cities of Asia Minor. Only a few resisted him, among them Lampsakos and Smyrna (Livy 33.38). Part of their resistance to Antiochos took the form of an appeal to the Roman forces then in Greece with L. Flamininus, and beyond them to the Roman senate itself.[1] In spite of the grateful and optimistic tone of the extant Lampsakene inscription honouring their ambassador to Rome, it does not seem as though Lampsakos was specifically included in the Roman treaty with Philip.[2] Nevertheless, Lampsakos and Smyrna would no doubt have fallen into the category of Greek Asian cities whose autonomy Rome made it its policy to support (Polyb. 18.44), and as such, their complaints against Antiochos were brought forward on the Roman side at the conference. Antiochos, resentful of the Roman presence in Asian affairs, and not wishing to give the appearance of defending himself against the charges of Lampsakos and Smyrna before a Roman tribunal, suggested that Rhodes could act as an arbitrator between himself and the disgruntled cities. Despite the phraseology employed by Antiochos, it is clear from the tenor of the entire affair that there was no question of Rome acting as a neutral arbitrator; the Greek cities had turned to Rome from the start as a champion, not as a judge, and it was in this capacity that Rome's envoys introduced their case into the conference.

It was instead the neutral Greek state of Rhodes that Antiochos proposed as a suitable arbitrator. Sometime during the 190s Rhodes also acted as arbitrator in the long-standing dispute between Samos and Priene (**74**). Individual Rhodian ambassadors had performed favours for Antiochos in the past, in settling a war on Crete (**58**) and in negotiating the marriage alliance with Ptolemy.[3] Rhodes had sufficient prestige at this time to act as an international arbitrator between the Greek states in Asia Minor, even between those states and the Seleukid monarchy. Rhodes would also have had the requisite neutrality.[4]

1. App. *Syr.* I.2; *ILampsakos* 4 (*SIG*^{3}591).

2. E. Bickermann, *Philologus* 87 (1932) pp. 277f.; Gruen, pp. 542f.; Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 2, p. 614; P. Frisch, *ILampsakos*, p. 26.

3. According to Hieronymos (*In Dan.* 3.11.17) Eukles the Rhodian negotiated the marriage between the Seleukid princess Kleopatra and Ptolemy V; see E. Olshausen, *Prosopographie der hellenistischen Königsgesandten* I (Louvain, 1974) 134.

4. Rhodes was now (after Kynoskephalai) in a state of more or less passive friendship with Antiochos; cf. Livy 33.20, and see Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 2, p. 602; Gruen, p. 541. Rawlings,

None of this means that Antiochos ever actually expected such an arbitration to be carried out. Neither the Hellenistic kings nor Rome was remarkable for willingness to submit to arbitration. Antiochos's offer would simply have been sufficient to put him in the right in the propaganda battle with the Romans at Lysimacheia. Rome was apparently not interested at this stage in pursuing the matter further, and Antiochos probably chose to ignore the claims of the two cities. Since Lampsakos and Smyrna were hostile to Antiochos at the time of the war between Rome and Antiochos, it seems unlikely that Rhodes arbitrated their case either in 196 or later.[5]

78. Larisa challenges Pteleion to accept Roman arbitration (after 196?)

An inscription, broken at the top and bottom, discovered at Larisa in Thessaly. No dimensions given.

G. Fougères, *BCH* 13 (1889) p. 379, no. 2; *Kern, *IG* IX.2.520.

A. Wilhelm, *AEM* 20 (1897) p. 90; Jardé/Laurent, *BCH* 26 (1902) p. 368, no. 4; Raeder 59; Tod 33; Larsen, *GFS,* pp. 288–89.

[. . . . . 21 . . . . . ο]υ δὲ Ξενοδόκου Φ- - - - - - - - - - -
. . . . . λιζόσιος Ἀφθονήτου εἶπεν· ἐπειδὴ Νύσα[νδρος Δι?]-
οδότου Λαρισαῖος εὔνους ὢν διατελεῖ τῆι πόλει τῶν [Πτε]-
λεειῶν, διατηρῶν τὴν ὑπάρχουσαν πρὸς τὸν δῆμον ε[ὔνοι]-
5 αν καὶ κοινῆι καὶ κατ' ἰδίαν τοῖς χρείαν ἔχουσι τῶν πολ[ι]-
[τ]ῶν ἐκτενῶς ἐπιδίδωσιν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ παραχ[α]-
[λο]ύμενα, βουλόμενος ἐπαύξειν καὶ κατὰ κοινὸν μὲν τὴν
[πό]λιν καὶ τοὺς κ[ατ' ἰ]δία[ν] ἀξίους τῶν πολιτῶν ἀξίως μ[ὲν]
[αὐτ]οῦ, ἀξίως δὲ καὶ τῆς πόλεως, οὐ μόνον δὲ ἐν τούτοις
10 [αὐτὸ]ν ἀπαράκλητος παρεσκεύακεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ Λαρισαίω[ν]
[τῶν] Φθιωτ[ῶν] ἐπισ[κηψ]άντων ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν ἀδίκως καὶ ἀ[νο]-
[σί]ως καὶ προκαλεσαμένων ἐπὶ κρίσιν εἰς Ῥώμην ἐπὶ τὴ[ν]
[σ]ύνκλητον ἐπέδωκεν αὐτὸν Νύσανδρος ἐπὶ τὸ
[π]ρεσβεῦσαι ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως μετὰ πάσης προθυμίας
15 [μ]ετὰ τῶν συνεξαποσταλέντων αὐτῶι πρεσβευτῶν [οὐ]-
[θ]ένα κίνδυνον πρ[οορώμε]νος οὐδὲ - - - - - - - - - -
. . . . 13 . . . . πάσας . . . του- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

however, favours the interpretation that there was a more active cooperation between Rhodes and Antiochos.

5. On Antiochos's later relations with Lampsakos and Smyrna, see Polyb. 21.13–14; Livy 35.42 and 37.34f.

None of this means that Antiochos ever actually expected such an arbitration to be carried out. Neither the Hellenistic kings nor Rome was remarkable for willingness to submit to arbitration. Antiochos's offer would simply have been sufficient to put him in the right in the propaganda battle with the Romans at Lysimacheia. Rome was apparently not interested at this stage in pursuing the matter further, and Antiochos probably chose to ignore the claims of the two cities. Since Lampsakos and Smyrna were hostile to Antiochos at the time of the war between Rome and Antiochos, it seems unlikely that Rhodes arbitrated their case either in 196 or later.[5]

78. Larisa challenges Pteleion to accept Roman arbitration (after 196?)

An inscription, broken at the top and bottom, discovered at Larisa in Thessaly. No dimensions given.

G. Fougères, *BCH* 13 (1889) p. 379, no. 2; *Kern, *IG* IX.2.520.

A. Wilhelm, *AEM* 20 (1897) p. 90; Jardé/Laurent, *BCH* 26 (1902) p. 368, no. 4; Raeder 59; Tod 33; Larsen, *GFS,* pp. 288–89.

[. . . . . 21 . . . . . ο]υ δὲ Ξενοδόκου Φ- - - - - - - - - - -
. . . . . λιζόσιος Ἀφθονήτου εἶπεν· ἐπειδὴ Νύσα[νδρος Δι?]-
οδότου Λαρισαῖος εὔνους ὢν διατελεῖ τῆι πόλει τῶν [Πτε]-
λεειῶν, διατηρῶν τὴν ὑπάρχουσαν πρὸς τὸν δῆμον ε[ὔνοι]-
5 αν καὶ κοινῆι καὶ κατ' ἰδίαν τοῖς χρείαν ἔχουσι τῶν πολ[ι]-
[τ]ῶν ἐκτενῶς ἐπιδίδωσιν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ παραχ[α]-
[λο]ύμενα, βουλόμενος ἐπαύξειν καὶ κατὰ κοινὸν μὲν τὴν
[πό]λιν καὶ τοὺς κ[ατ' ἰ]δία[ν] ἀξίους τῶν πολιτῶν ἀξίως μ[ὲν]
[αὐτ]οῦ, ἀξίως δὲ καὶ τῆς πόλεως, οὐ μόνον δὲ ἐν τούτοις
10 [αὐτὸ]ν ἀπαράκλητος παρεσκεύακεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ Λαρισαίω[ν]
[τῶν] Φθιωτ[ῶν] ἐπισ[κηψ]άντων ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν ἀδίκως καὶ ἀ[νο]-
[σί]ως καὶ προκαλεσαμένων ἐπὶ κρίσιν εἰς Ῥώμην ἐπὶ τὴ[ν]
[σ]ύνκλητον ἐπέδωκεν αὐτὸν Νύσανδρος ἐπὶ τὸ
[π]ρεσβεῦσαι ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως μετὰ πάσης προθυμίας
15 [μ]ετὰ τῶν συνεξαποσταλέντων αὐτῶι πρεσβευτῶν [οὐ]-
[θ]ένα κίνδυνον πρ[οορώμε]νος οὐδὲ - - - - - - - - - -
. . . . 13 . . . . πάσας . . . του- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

however, favours the interpretation that there was a more active cooperation between Rhodes and Antiochos.

5. On Antiochos's later relations with Lampsakos and Smyrna, see Polyb. 21.13–14; Livy 35.42 and 37.34f.

1: [στρατηγο]ῦ: Fougères. [γενομένο]υ δὲ or [κοινο]ῦ δὲ Ξενοδόκου Φ- -: Kern *add.* Φ[αρσαλίου]: Fougères. || 2: Αἰζόσιος: Kern *add.* || 11–12: ἀ[ναι|τί]ως: Fougères. || 15–16: οὐ|[δ]ένα: Fougères. || 16: πρ[οηγούμε]νος: Fougères. πρ[οορώμε]νος: Wilhelm.

In this decree of the city of Pteleion, Nysandros, a citizen of Thessalian Larisa, is honoured for numerous benefactions. Among other things, he acted as advocate for the Pteleians in a dispute that they had with their neighbour, Larisa Kremaste (Phthiotis). It is clear from the inscription that Larisa had initiated a suit against Pteleion and challenged the Pteleians to submit to the arbitration of the Roman senate.[1] Pteleion was naturally obliged to send an embassy to Rome to defend itself, and Nysandros, a foreigner, may have acted as chief advocate.[2] Perhaps he had influence and ties at Rome that the small city of Pteleion could not emulate. We do not know the nature of the accusations brought against Pteleion by Larisa. Stählin thought that this was a land dispute, over the fertile areas between the two states.[3] Nothing in the inscription gives us any evidence for this, however, and indeed the wording would be unusual for a border dispute. The emphasis placed on the injustice and impiety of Larisa's denunciations of Pteleion scarcely leads us to believe that this is a matter of conflicting claims to a piece of land, even when we recognize the fact that this is a Pteleian decree. Rather, it seems that Larisa may have accused Pteleion of some "crime," although an attempt to establish exactly what could only be speculation.

This case is one of many disputes that the Greek cities submitted to Rome for settlement. The appeal to Roman arbitration became an ever more significant trend among the Greeks after the end of the Second Macedonian War. Unfortunately we can tell nothing from this inscription of the procedure of the senate here. Whether the senate itself judged the matter, whether it passed it on to a committee, or whether it passed it on to commissioners who would be visiting Greece and would investigate the matter there cannot be determined.

1. Lines 11–13; on the term προκαλέω, "to invite or challenge a party to arbitration," cf. **63**.

2. It is not stated explicitly that Nysandros acted as the head of the embassy, but the tone of the inscription leads us to believe that he may well have been.

3. Stählin, p. 182; Raeder, p. 103, who also thought it was a border dispute.

79. A boundary dispute between Melitaia and Narthakion settled through the Thessalian League (after 196)

Passages from the Narthakian inscription cited in case **156** (q.v. for editions and bibliography).

. . . . [κ]αὶ περὶ
τῆς χώρας καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν κριτηρίοις [νεν]ικηκ[έ]
50 ναι κατὰ νόμους τοὺς Θεσσαλῶν, οἷς [νό]-
μοις ἕως τα[ν]ῦν χρῶν[τ]αι, οὓς νόμους Τίτος
Κοΐγκτιος ὕπατος ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν δέκα πρες-
βευτῶν γνώμης ἔδωκεν καὶ κατὰ δόγμα
συγκλήτου κτλ.

. . . . ὅσα κεκριμένα ἐστὶν κατὰ νόμους
οὓς Τίτος Κοΐγκτιος ὕπατος ἔδωκεν, ταῦτα, κα-
65 θὼς κεκριμένα ἐστιν, οὕτω δοκεῖ κύρια εἶναι δεῖν·

The present case is another in the series of judgements given in the land dispute between the Thessalian towns of Melitaia and Narthakion. In arguing their claims before the Roman senate shortly after the middle of the second century, the Melitaians had listed a number of past awards favourable to them. It is from the Narthakian counterclaim that we learn of the present award, favourable to Narthakion, made at some time after the end of the Second Macedonian War. The Narthakians say that at that time the land was adjudged to them according to the "laws of the Thessalians," which were established by Flamininus, the Roman proconsul who became responsible for the settlement of Greece. The reference must be to the administrative and constitutional work carried out by Flamininus and the decemvirate in Thessaly in 194.[1] It should be emphasized that this arbitration is not said to have been carried out by Flamininus himself, but rather in accordance with laws that he set down. Indeed, it could even be argued that the Narthakian embassy brought up Flamininus's name after 146 only in order to lend greater weight to the claim that they were making in front of a Roman audience. Nevertheless, it is not unlikely that Flamininus's organization of Thessaly may have included the arbitration of certain outstanding claims between the member states as well as the institution of legislation. At any rate, his dispositions were later ratified by the senate (Livy

1. Livy 34.51.3–6. See **76**. Flamininus's work in Thessaly may in fact have begun as early as late 196. This inscription implies that the decemvirate was still working with Flamininus when the Thessalian constitution was reestablished, and the ten legates left Greece in the winter of 196/5 (see Briscoe, *Books XXXIV–XXXVII,* p. 128).

34.57), and it seems reasonable to assume that this ratification is the δόγμα cυγκλήτου of lines 53–54 of this inscription.[2]

80. A Tenian tribunal arbitrates between Zarax and Epidauros Limera (?) (after 195)

Two fragments of a stele (A and B) found in the precinct of Apollo Hyperteleatas near the village of Phoiniki in Lakonia. Wilhelm recognized that both fragments were part of the same stele. A: h: 0.25 m; w: 0.15 m. B: h: 0.26 m; w: 0.17 m.

G. Mylonas, *BCH* 9 (1885) pp. 244–46, nos. 2–3; Meister, *SGDI* 4546–47; Berard 3; Kolbe, *IG* V.1.931; *Wilhelm, *GIRI,* pp. 60–67; *SEG* XIII.259 (after Wilhelm).

Sonne 33; Raeder 61; Swoboda, *Klio* 12 (1912) p. 34 n. 1; Tod 3; Steinwenter, pp. 183 n. 1, 186; Robert, *REG* 1953, 76; *SEG* XI.894.

A [Ἐπειδὴ Ἀγγελῆc καὶ Θε]όδωροc οἱ Ζή-
[νωνοc καὶ πρότερον μὲν τ]ᾶc πόλεοc τῶν
[Ζαραχίων ἐπαγαγούcαc ἀ]μῖν ἀμφιcβήτη-
[cιν περὶ τᾶc ἀμφιλεγομέν?]ας χώρας ἀπο
5 [- - - - - - - - - - cκ]οπιᾶc τᾶc ἐπὶ τῷ
- - - - - - - - - - - - καὶ τῶν ὑδάτων κα[ὶ]
[τῶν ποτι- or cυγκυρόντων] ταύται καὶ τοῦ λι-
[μένοc θέλοντεc βοηθ]ῆcαι τᾶι πόλει παρε-
[γένοντο καὶ παρακελε]υcάμενοι χαρίζε-
10 [cθαι τᾷ πόλει ἁμῶν καὶ] δικαιολογηθέν-
[τεc ἐνίκαcαν ταύτ]αν τὰγ κρίcιν, Ζαραχίων
[δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν δικαcτᾶν τ]ῶν ἐκ Τήνου τῶμ περὶ
[- - - - - - - - - ὑπ]ὲρ τᾶc χώρας λαβόντων
[παλινδικίαν καὶ κιν]δυνευόντων ἁμῶν τὰν
15 [χώραν ἃc ἐκρατήcα]μεν ταύταν ἀποβαλεῖ[ν]
[καὶ εἰc ζαμίαν μεγίc]ταν ἐμπεcεῖν, ὁμοίωc Ἀ[γ]-
[γελῆc καὶ Θεόδωροc τοῖc] δικαcταῖc παραγενόμε-
[νοι καὶ δικαιολογ]ηθέντεc ἐνίκαcαν τὰγ κρί-
[cιν καὶ τοὺc πολίτα]c ἠλευθέρωcαν τᾶc αἰτί-
20 [ας, τ]ὰ κατ . . 7 . . χώρας . . . 14 . . .

2. See Viereck, p. 19; Raeder, p. 49; Accame, p. 70; Lécrivain, p. 13; et al. For speculation that some other *senatus consultum* is meant, cf. Laticheff, pp. 379–80; Berard, p. 35; Dittenberger, *SIG*^{2}, p. 490; Willems, p. 713; Sonne 28. It is possible that Aitolia retained Melitaia, along with certain other Phthiotic Achaian holdings, in the wake of the Second Macedonian War (Walbank, *Comm,* vol. 2, p. 617; Flacelière, pp. 349f.; Stählin, p. 164); if so, the Thessalian arbitration between Melitaia and Narthakion is more likely to have taken place after 189, when Thessaly was able to lay claim to all of Achaia Phthiotis.

34.57), and it seems reasonable to assume that this ratification is the δόγμα cυγκλήτου of lines 53–54 of this inscription.[2]

80. A Tenian tribunal arbitrates between Zarax and Epidauros Limera (?) (after 195)

Two fragments of a stele (A and B) found in the precinct of Apollo Hyperteleatas near the village of Phoiniki in Lakonia. Wilhelm recognized that both fragments were part of the same stele. A: h: 0.25 m; w: 0.15 m. B: h: 0.26 m; w: 0.17 m.

G. Mylonas, *BCH* 9 (1885) pp. 244–46, nos. 2–3; Meister, *SGDI* 4546–47; Berard 3; Kolbe, *IG* V.1.931; *Wilhelm, *GIRI,* pp. 60–67; *SEG* XIII.259 (after Wilhelm).

Sonne 33; Raeder 61; Swoboda, *Klio* 12 (1912) p. 34 n. 1; Tod 3; Steinwenter, pp. 183 n. 1, 186; Robert, *REG* 1953, 76; *SEG* XI.894.

A [Ἐπειδὴ Ἀγγελῆc καὶ Θε]όδωροc οἱ Ζή-
[νωνοc καὶ πρότερον μὲν τ]ᾶc πόλεοc τῶν
[Ζαραχίων ἐπαγαγούcαc ἀ]μῖν ἀμφιcβήτη-
[cιν περὶ τᾶc ἀμφιλεγομέν?]ας χώρας ἀπο
5 [- - - - - - - - - - cκ]οπιᾶc τᾶc ἐπὶ τῷ
- - - - - - - - - - - - καὶ τῶν ὑδάτων κα[ὶ]
[τῶν ποτι- or cυγκυρόντων] ταύται καὶ τοῦ λι-
[μένοc θέλοντεc βοηθ]ῆcαι τᾶι πόλει παρε-
[γένοντο καὶ παρακελε]υcάμενοι χαρίζε-
10 [cθαι τᾷ πόλει ἁμῶν καὶ] δικαιολογηθέν-
[τεc ἐνίκαcαν ταύτ]αν τὰγ κρίcιν, Ζαραχίων
[δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν δικαcτᾶν τ]ῶν ἐκ Τήνου τῶμ περὶ
[- - - - - - - - - ὑπ]ὲρ τᾶc χώρας λαβόντων
[παλινδικίαν καὶ κιν]δυνευόντων ἁμῶν τὰν
15 [χώραν ἃc ἐκρατήcα]μεν ταύταν ἀποβαλεῖ[ν]
[καὶ εἰc ζαμίαν μεγίc]ταν ἐμπεcεῖν, ὁμοίωc Ἀ[γ]-
[γελῆc καὶ Θεόδωροc τοῖc] δικαcταῖc παραγενόμε-
[νοι καὶ δικαιολογ]ηθέντεc ἐνίκαcαν τὰγ κρί-
[cιν καὶ τοὺc πολίτα]c ἠλευθέρωcαν τᾶc αἰτί-
20 [ας, τ]ὰ κατ . . 7 . . χώρας . . . 14 . . .

2. See Viereck, p. 19; Raeder, p. 49; Accame, p. 70; Lécrivain, p. 13; et al. For speculation that some other *senatus consultum* is meant, cf. Laticheff, pp. 379–80; Berard, p. 35; Dittenberger, *SIG*^{2}, p. 490; Willems, p. 713; Sonne 28. It is possible that Aitolia retained Melitaia, along with certain other Phthiotic Achaian holdings, in the wake of the Second Macedonian War (Walbank, *Comm,* vol. 2, p. 617; Flacelière, pp. 349f.; Stählin, p. 164); if so, the Thessalian arbitration between Melitaia and Narthakion is more likely to have taken place after 189, when Thessaly was able to lay claim to all of Achaia Phthiotis.

B [ἀπ]εκατέστ[ησαν τᾶι] δ̣ίχ[αι, ὅπως οὖν φανερὸν]
ε̣ἶ πᾶσι τοῖς θ[έλου]σι εὐ[εργετεῖν τὰν πόλιν, ὅ]-
τι τὰς καταξίας χάρι[τας ἀποδίδωτι τοῖς ἑαυταῖς]
εὐεργέταις, δεδόχθαι τ[ᾶι πόλει τῶν Ἐπιδαυρί]-
ων· ἐπαινέσαι Ἀγγελῆ κα[ὶ Θεόδωρον τοὺς Ζή]-
νωνος ἀρετᾶς ἕνεκεν κ[αὶ εὐνοίας, ἃς ἔχον]-
τες διατελοῦσιν εἰς τὰ[ν πόλιν, δεδόσθαι δὲ αὐ]-
τοῖς καὶ εἰς ἀνδριάντα ἢ ε[ἰκόνα ἑκατέρωι ἐφ' ἡμί]-
σ̣ει ἀν' ἔτη δύο τὸ θαλάσσ[ιον τέλος, τῶν ἐφόρων?]
ποτιγραψαμένων ποτὶ τᾶ[ι ὠνᾶι, ὅτι ἔχουσιν αὐτὰν]
ἔν τε τῶ ἐπὶ Εὐδαμίδα ἐνι[αυτῶι καὶ ἐν τῶι μετ']
Εὐδαμίδαν· εἶμεν δ[ὲ α]ὐτο[ῖς καὶ σίτησιν ἐν τῶ]
ἀρχείωι· καλεῖσθαι δὲ αὐτοὺ̣[ς εἰς προεδρίαν]
ἐν τοῖς ἀγῶσιν, οἷς τίθητι ἁ π̣[όλις· ἀναγράψαι δὲ]
καὶ τὸ ψάφισμα τόδε εἰς σ̣τ̣[άλαν λιθίναν τοὺς]
ἐφόρους τοὺς ἐνὰρχου[σ]ι κ̣[αὶ ἀναθέμεν εἰς τὸ]
[ἰ]ερὸν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ [Ὑπερτελεάτα· Καρ]-
νείου δεκάται.

3: [Ζαραχίων εἰσαγούσας ἡ]μῖν: Mylonas, Berard, Meister. || 4–5: χώρας ἀπο|[τεινούσας ἀπὸ]: Mylonas, Berard. || 7: [ὁμορούντων] αὐτᾶι: Mylonas. || 10–11: δικαιολογηθέντ[ων καὶ νι|κᾶν μελλόντων]: Sonne, Berard. || 11: [νικώντων δὲ] τὰγ κρίσιν: Mylonas. || 12: [παρὰ τῶν δικαστῶν]: Mylonas, Berard. || 13: [τὰν ἀμφισβήτησιν]: Mylonas, Sonne, Berard, Meister. || 13–14: λαβόντων [ἀμ|ῶν δίκην]: Sonne. || 14–15: [κ]α[τα|δικάζεσθαι]: Mylonas, Berard, Meister. κ[ρ]α[τεῖ|σθαι]: Sonne. || 15: [καὶ τὰν χώρ]αν: Mylonas, Sonne, Berard, Meister. || 16: [καὶ εἰς μεγάλαν ἀπορί]αν: Mylonas, Sonne, Berard, Meister. [εἰς δὲ ζαμίαν]: Kolbe. || 16–17: ἀ[νθι|στάμενοι]: Sonne. || 17: [παρὰ τοῖς δι]κασταῖς: Mylonas, Sonne, Berard, Meister. || 19: [ἡμᾶς ἀπ]ηλευθέρωσαν: Sonne. || 19–20: τὰς αἰτ|[ιωμένας ἁμῶν] χώρας: Mylonas, Berard. τᾶς αἰτ[ί|ας τᾶς περὶ τᾶς] χώρας: Sonne. || 21: [δ]ὲ κατέστ[ησαν τᾶς] δ̣ίχ[ας]: Kolbe. || 24–25: [τῶν Κοτυρτατ]|ῶν: Mylonas. || 25: Ἀππελῆ: Mylonas, Meister. || 27–28: [καὶ τελέσαι αὐ]|τοῖς: Mylonas. [δόμεν δὲ αὐ]|τοῖς: Kolbe. || 28–29: ε[ἶμεν δ' αὐτοῖς ἀτέλ]|ειαν: Mylonas. ε[ἰκόνα γραπτὰν καθ' ἡμί]|σειαν: Kolbe. || 29: τὸ Θαλα- - (Thalamai): Meister. || 30: ποτ[ὶ ταύται τᾶι ἀτελείαι]: Mylonas. || 32: [α]ὐτο[ῖς ἀναγραφὰν]: Mylonas.

This inscription records honours voted to two citizens for their services as advocates in an arbitral trial.[1] The arbitration was carried out by a tribunal from

1. Swoboda argued that this inscription must postdate 146 and the dissolution, as he believed, of the Achaian League, which is nowhere mentioned (*Klio* 12, p. 34). But it is by no means definite that the Lakonian towns actually became regular members of the Achaian League as of 195 (Larsen, *GFS*, p. 403; cf. the discussion in **81**); and in any case, the argument that the Achaian League must of necessity appear in any arbitration between its members is not completely valid (cf. **63** and **138**). It is therefore entirely possible that this inscription predates 146. But the fact that there appears to have been no Roman involvement in this dispute does not *demand* that we give this arbitration a date before 146. Greece was not provincialized in

Tenos between the Lakonian community of Zarax and an unknown state, the promulgator of this decree. This state may well have been Epidauros Limera, a better conjecture for a state that would have a boundary dispute with Zarax than either Azopos or Kotyrta, both suggested by previous scholars.[2] The Epidaurian advocates were two brothers, Angeles and Theodoros, sons of Zenon. They defended their state's case in a dispute with Zarax over territory that included such landmarks as watercourses (or sources), a summit that may have had a watchtower, and a harbour. They won their case, but the Zarachian advocates were apparently successful in their demands for a second trial (lines 11f.), this time in front of a Tenian tribunal.[3] The Epidaurian decree emphasizes the danger they were in of losing their case, and the gravity of the penalty they would subsequently have faced. Accordingly, it emphasizes the value of the services of the sons of Zenon, when they again succeeded in winning the case.

81. The Lakedaimonian *koinon* arbitrates between Geronthrai and a neighbour (after 195)

A stone inscribed on both sides (A and B), found at Geronthrai.

P. LeBas, *RA* 2 (1845–46) pp. 73f., 139f.; LeBas/Foucart 228; Cauer[2] 30; P. Müllensiefen, *De titulorum Laconicorum dialecto* (Strasbourg, 1882) 43; Meister, *SGDI* 4530; Berard 4 (partial); *Kolbe, *IG* V.1.1111; Schwyzer 48.

Sonne 23; Raeder 81; Swoboda, *Klio* 12 (1912) p. 34; Tod 4; Robert, *REG* 37 (1924) pp. 180–81; *SEG* III.321; S. Accame, *Il dominio romano in Grecia* (Rome, 1946) p. 126; *SEG* XI.911.

A [Ἔδοξε τᾶι πόλι τῶν Γερονθρη]τᾶν· ἐ[πει-
[δὴ - - - - - - - - Ἐρετριεὺς] καὶ Ἐτε-
[- - - - - - - - - - - - -π]ᾳρα[γ]ενό[με-
[νοι - - - - - - - - - - - -]οστον οι

146, and Roman mediation in Greek disputes both before and after that date was frequently the result of Greek appeals, not Roman intervention.

2. Kotyrta: Sonne, Tod; Azopos: Raeder; Thalamai: Meister; see Kolbe and Wilhelm (p. 62) for the choice of Epidauros Limera. Tenos, the arbitrating state, could be the Aegean island, but it is more likely to be the Lakonian town. See Mylonas, p. 247 n. 1; Berard. On the other hand, the island of Tenos did have ties with the Peloponnese, such as a *symbolon* agreement with the Achaian League as a whole (*IG* XII.5.829).

3. It is not certain that Tenos did not act as the arbitrator in both trials. It might seem unlikely that if Zarax successfully overturned the unfavourable first decision, perhaps on a charge of corruption (Kolbe's suggestion), the second judgement should then be made by the same judges. But cf. **38** and **166**.

Tenos between the Lakonian community of Zarax and an unknown state, the promulgator of this decree. This state may well have been Epidauros Limera, a better conjecture for a state that would have a boundary dispute with Zarax than either Azopos or Kotyrta, both suggested by previous scholars.[2] The Epidaurian advocates were two brothers, Angeles and Theodoros, sons of Zenon. They defended their state's case in a dispute with Zarax over territory that included such landmarks as watercourses (or sources), a summit that may have had a watchtower, and a harbour. They won their case, but the Zarachian advocates were apparently successful in their demands for a second trial (lines 11f.), this time in front of a Tenian tribunal.[3] The Epidaurian decree emphasizes the danger they were in of losing their case, and the gravity of the penalty they would subsequently have faced. Accordingly, it emphasizes the value of the services of the sons of Zenon, when they again succeeded in winning the case.

81. The Lakedaimonian *koinon* arbitrates between Geronthrai and a neighbour (after 195)

A stone inscribed on both sides (A and B), found at Geronthrai.

P. LeBas, *RA* 2 (1845–46) pp. 73f., 139f.; LeBas/Foucart 228; Cauer[2] 30; P. Müllensiefen, *De titulorum Laconicorum dialecto* (Strasbourg, 1882) 43; Meister, *SGDI* 4530; Berard 4 (partial); *Kolbe, *IG* V.1.1111; Schwyzer 48.

Sonne 23; Raeder 81; Swoboda, *Klio* 12 (1912) p. 34; Tod 4; Robert, *REG* 37 (1924) pp. 180–81; *SEG* III.321; S. Accame, *Il dominio romano in Grecia* (Rome, 1946) p. 126; *SEG* XI.911.

A [Ἔδοξε τᾶι πόλι τῶν Γερονθρη]τᾶν· ἐ[πει-
[δὴ - - - - - - - - Ἐρετριεὺς] καὶ Ἐτε-
[- - - - - - - - - - - - -π]ᾳρα[γ]ενό[με-
[νοι - - - - - - - - - - - -]οστον οι

146, and Roman mediation in Greek disputes both before and after that date was frequently the result of Greek appeals, not Roman intervention.

2. Kotyrta: Sonne, Tod; Azopos: Raeder; Thalamai: Meister; see Kolbe and Wilhelm (p. 62) for the choice of Epidauros Limera. Tenos, the arbitrating state, could be the Aegean island, but it is more likely to be the Lakonian town. See Mylonas, p. 247 n. 1; Berard. On the other hand, the island of Tenos did have ties with the Peloponnese, such as a *symbolon* agreement with the Achaian League as a whole (*IG* XII.5.829).

3. It is not certain that Tenos did not act as the arbitrator in both trials. It might seem unlikely that if Zarax successfully overturned the unfavourable first decision, perhaps on a charge of corruption (Kolbe's suggestion), the second judgement should then be made by the same judges. But cf. **38** and **166**.

- - - - - - - - - - - -ν . . ετο κατὰ τὸ
[δυνατὸν, - - - - - - -] Ἐρετριέα, Ἐτ[ε]
[- - - - - - - ἀνάγγει]λ[ά]ν τε ὅσας ἐτύν-
[χανον - - - - - - -]ενον δὲ εἰς [Εὐ]ρώτα[ν]
[- - - - - - εἰς τ]ὰν [πόλι]ν ἀνεστρεμμέ-
[νοι εἰσὶν - - - ἀξί]ως μὲν τῶ ἔθνεος [τῶ]
[ἀποστείλαν]τος α[ὐ]τώς, ἀξίως δὲ τᾶν βι- -
[- - - - - - - - κ]αὶ [ἐ]πὶ τοῖς γεγωναμένοις
- - - - -ω . . ει . . ερα . . . \ . εὐδοκοῦντε[ς]
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -ωκινια εξι
[- - - - δ]ιαλύ[σαν]τος ως . . . . λιαν καὶ συ
- - - - - - - - - - - -ντα. καὶ ἐπὶ Προξέν[ω]
[τῶν - -]δ[- - ἐπιφερομ]ένων ἐπὶ κοινῷ [τῶν]
[Λακεδαιμονίων δίκ]ας τ[ᾶι] πόλι τῶν Γερονθ[ρη]-
[τᾶν, παρεκάλεσαν α]ὐτὼς καὶ τὸν γραμματῆ
[αὐτῶν] . . . . . τον Κόσσω Καρύστιον καὶ
[προσείλοντο ἐκ τῶν] Λακεδαιμονίων καθ . .
- - - - - - - - - - - -οκράτιος Γυθειά-
[ταν, - - - - - - -]οκράτη Πυρίχιον καὶ ἀ[π]-
[έστειλαν αὐτὼς] εἰς τὰν πόλιν ταύταν Ι
[- - - - - - - - - - κ]αὶ θ' [ἄ]τερα ἃ ἔδει α[ὐ]-
[τοῖς καὶ τᾶς κρίσεως στέλλ]εσθαι τὸ ἀντίγραφον·
[εἶμεν δὲ αὐτὼς] καὶ ἐγγόνως προξένως καὶ [εὐ]-
[εργέτας τ]ᾶ[ς πόλι]ος τῶν Γερονθρητᾶν·
Β καὶ ἔχην ἔγκτησιν γᾶς τε [κ]α[ὶ οἰκίας]
καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τίμια ὑπάρχην α[ὐτοῖς ὅ]-
σα καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς προξένοις καὶ ε[ὐ]-
εργέταις τᾶς πόλιος· εἶμεν δὲ α[ὐτοῖς]
καὶ ἀτέλειαν καὶ εἰσαγόντοις καὶ ἐ[ξα]-
γόντοις καὶ πολέμω καὶ ἰράνας· τὰν [δὲ]
προξενίαν ταύταν ἀναγραψάντ[ω τοὶ ἔφο]-
ροι τοὶ ἐπὶ στραταγῶ Ξενοφάνεος [εἰς]
στάλαν πετρίναν ἐν τοῖ ἱεροῖ τῶ [Ἀπόλ]-
λωνος· τὸ δὲ ἀνάλωμα ἁ πόλις δότ[ω.]

1: [Δεδόχθαι]: Cauer, Meister. || 2: ἐ[πεὶ]: Cauer, Meister. || 4: τὸν οἰ: Cauer, Meister. || 6: ἔτον: Cauer. || 7: [π]ρωτα: Cauer. || 11–12: ἀξίως δὲ τᾶν βι|διᾶν πατρίδων: Robert. || 16: [πά]ντα: Cauer, Meister. || 20: [παρακαλεῖν]: Cauer, Berard. || 22–23: [ἐκ τῶ κοινῶ τῶν] Λακεδαιμονίων καθ[ελ|έσθαι]: Cauer, Berard. || 24: [Ἀριστ]οκράτη Πυρίχιον: Cauer, Berard. || 24–25: ἀ[πο|στεῖλαι]: Cauer, Berard. || 27: [ἀναπέμπ]εσθαι τὸ ἀντίγραφον: Cauer, Berard.

This inscription from Laconia is a decree of the town of Geronthrai, in which the Geronthraians voted proxeny privileges to certain citizens of Eretria and Karystos. These individuals had been invited to Geronthrai to act as foreign judges, that institution so common in the Hellenistic period. They evidently performed this task with even more than the usual zeal, because the

Geronthraians invited the Euboian judges to stay on and represent them in an intercity dispute that was being heard before the Lakedaimonian League (τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων). This at any rate is the interpretation followed by Berard, Tod, and Raeder; but the stone is very mutilated, and it is impossible to make such a definite judgement.[1] The Euboians again acquitted themselves so well, presumably as advocates, that the Geronthraians enthusiastically voted them various honours. Unfortunately, the only part of the stone that is clearly legible is the standard formulaic inscription of the honours of *proxenia* and *euergesia*.

The dating of this document has given some trouble in the past, not least through the confusion of the *koinon* of the Lakedaimonians with the *koinon* of the Eleutherolakones.[2] But epigraphic and numismatic evidence indicates the existence of a κοινὸν τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων in the period long before the principate and Augustus's establishment of the Eleutherolakonian League. The Romans may have established the Lakedaimonian *koinon* in 195; Augustus may have been responsible for modifying its constitution and changing its name. Thus it is entirely possible that this inscription is to be dated to the period shortly following 195. When Nabis was defeated, Flamininus put the perioikic cities under Achaian protection. If the *koinon* of the Lakedaimonians was indeed established at the same time, then it would have existed under the auspices of the Achaian League perhaps until 146.[3] This fact might suggest that the member states of the Lakedaimonian *koinon* would be affected by aspects of Achaian federal custom. Arbitration was a well-precedented practice in the Achaian League by this time. The same practice would logically be extended to the perioikic towns of Lakonia, even though their attachment to the League was much looser than that of a full-fledged member. So Geronthrai and a neighbour went to arbitration, but the body vested with the power of judgement was not the Achaian League but rather the local Lakedaimonian *koinon*. In keeping with its customary practice, the Achaian League might have been quite happy to see another party carry out the actual task of arbitration. Whatever the nature of the Lakedaimonian *koinon*'s relationship with the Achaian League, then, it seems that in the area of arbitration, the *koinon*'s practice was very much like many other independent leagues. The federal body was concerned to be active in

1. Kolbe appears to believe that the Euboians themselves acted as judges in the intercity dispute.

2. See K. T. Chrimes, *Ancient Sparta* (Manchester, 1949), App. III: "The Lacedaimonian and Free Laconian Leagues," pp. 435–41. Cf. also Piper, pp. 161–62; and Accame, p. 126.

3. See Piper, pp. 161–62; Cartledge/Spawforth, *Sparta*, p. 90. Chrimes (p. 439) points out that the *koinon* of the Lakedaimonians was fully capable of existing under the auspices of the Achaian League, and denies Swoboda's view (which contradicts the evidence of both Pausanias and Strabo) that the *koinon* could have been constituted only after 146.

preventing or settling disputes between its members; and it preferred to keep such activity within the immediate federal family.

82. A boundary arbitration (?) between Alipheira and Lepreion (after 194/3?)

Two fragments of a stele discovered at Alipheira in Arkadia. A: h (max.): 0.26 m; w (max.): 0.76 m; d: 0.10 m. B: h (max.): 0.28 m; w (max.): 0.22 m; d: 0.05 m.

A. K. Orlandos, Ἡ Ἀρκαδικὴ Ἀλίφειρα καὶ τὰ μνημεῖά της (Athens, 1967–68) pp. 158–67, nos. 3 (A), 4 (B); *A. G. Woodhead, *SEG* XXV.449; L. Dubois, *Recherches sur le dialecte arcadien* II (Louvain, 1988) pp. 248–54.

A. K. Orlandos, Ἡ Ἀρκαδικὴ Ἀλίφειρα, p. 15; Robert, *REG* 1969, 266; N. D. Robertson, *Hesperia* 45 (1976) pp. 265–66; *SEG* XXVII.44.

A [Θ ε ό] c.
[- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - Ἀλ]ιφειρέων περὶ τὰ
[- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - Λεπ]ρεᾶται τοῖς Ἀλιφειρε-
[ῦσιν - - - - - - - - - - - - καθάπε]ρ ἔδειξαν οἱ Ἀλιφε-
[ιρεῖς - - - - - - - - - - - - - τ]ὰν ἐπὶ τὸν μέσον δ-
[ρόμον? - - - - - - - - - - - - π]ὰρ τὸ Κυδωνάσιον καὶ
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - τὰν ὁδὸν ἐπ' ὀρθὰς
[- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - ἰν τ]οῖ ἱεροῖ τῶ Λε-
[υκαίω - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -] ὁδὸν τὰν ἐπὶ
- -γοντα ἰν τοῖ δε
[- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - Με]λιτέαι ἰν Μαινέαι
[- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - ὁδὸ]ν τὰν ἐπὶ Μαλίαν
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -ΑΝΧΑΓΟΝΡΑΣΤΥ
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - Κρεμύης ἃς κα
- -ι τὸ Κανθάρ[ιον]
- -ν καὶ τὰς πα . . . . .
[- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - Ἀλιφ]ειρεῖς ἀπὸ . . . . . .

lacuna

B -ας ὑπ- - -
[- δ]δὸν τὰν ὑπὸ
[- ὐ]π' ὀχετὸν διὰ . Ι .
- -ι τὰν τρικέλευθο[ν
- -ος τραχυλίας ἰμβά-
[λλει?- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -] αἴ τινα διὰ τὰς
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - αἴ κ'ἀνὰ ΠΕΛ . Ι καὶ ἐπ[ὶ]
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -σιν τὰν πολύκοινο[ν]
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - ἃς ἔλαβον οἱ Ἀλιφ-
[ειρεῖς - - - - - - - - - - - - - ἐπ]άνω τῶ ἱερῶ τῶ Διὸ-

preventing or settling disputes between its members; and it preferred to keep such activity within the immediate federal family.

82. A boundary arbitration (?) between Alipheira and Lepreion (after 194/3?)

Two fragments of a stele discovered at Alipheira in Arkadia. A: h (max.): 0.26 m; w (max.): 0.76 m; d: 0.10 m. B: h (max.): 0.28 m; w (max.): 0.22 m; d: 0.05 m.

A. K. Orlandos, Ἡ Ἀρκαδικὴ Ἀλίφειρα καὶ τὰ μνημεῖά της (Athens, 1967–68) pp. 158–67, nos. 3 (A), 4 (B); *A. G. Woodhead, *SEG* XXV.449; L. Dubois, *Recherches sur le dialecte arcadien* II (Louvain, 1988) pp. 248–54.

A. K. Orlandos, Ἡ Ἀρκαδικὴ Ἀλίφειρα, p. 15; Robert, *REG* 1969, 266; N. D. Robertson, *Hesperia* 45 (1976) pp. 265–66; *SEG* XXVII.44.

A [Θ ε ό] c.
[- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - Ἀλ]ιφειρέων περὶ τὰ
[- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - Λεπ]ρεᾶται τοῖς Ἀλιφειρε-
[ῦσιν - - - - - - - - - - - - καθάπε]ρ ἔδειξαν οἱ Ἀλιφε-
[ιρεῖς - - - - - - - - - - - - - τ]ὰν ἐπὶ τὸν μέσον δ-
[ρόμον? - - - - - - - - - - - - π]ὰρ τὸ Κυδωνάσιον καὶ
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - τὰν ὁδὸν ἐπ' ὀρθὰς
[- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - ἰν τ]οῖ ἱεροῖ τῶ Λε-
[υκαίω - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -] ὁδὸν τὰν ἐπὶ
- -γοντα ἰν τοῖ δε
[- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - Με]λιτέαι ἰν Μαινέαι
[- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - ὁδὸ]ν τὰν ἐπὶ Μαλίαν
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -ΑΝΧΑΓΟΝΡΑΣΤΥ
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - Κρεμύης ἃς κα
- -ι τὸ Κανθάρ[ιον]
- -ν καὶ τὰς πα . . . . .
[- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - Ἀλιφ]ειρεῖς ἀπὸ . . . . . .

lacuna

B -ας ὑπ- - -
[- δ]δὸν τὰν ὑπὸ
[- ὐ]π' ὀχετὸν διὰ . Ι .
- -ι τὰν τρικέλευθο[ν
- -ος τραχυλίας ἰμβά-
[λλει?- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -] αἴ τινα διὰ τὰς
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - αἴ κ'ἀνὰ ΠΕΛ . Ι καὶ ἐπ[ὶ]
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -σιν τὰν πολύκοινο[ν]
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - ἃς ἔλαβον οἱ Ἀλιφ-
[ειρεῖς - - - - - - - - - - - - - ἐπ]άνω τῶ ἱερῶ τῶ Διὸ-

[c - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - τὸc] τέρμονας τὸc κατὰ
- - - - - - - - - - - - - Δικασταί· ἐνικα-
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

arbitration."[3] A similar objection is brought against the period 199/8 to c. 194/3, during which Alipheira was incorporated in Megalopolis. Robertson finds the most reasonable conjecture for a date to be after 194/3, when Philopoimen detached a number of Arkadian towns, including Alipheira, from Megalopolis (Plut. *Phil.* 13).

83. An Eretrian arbitration between Naxos and Paros (194–166)

Two fragments (A and B), recognized as belonging to the same inscription by Wilhelm (*JÖAI* 8 [1905]).

A: The upper part of a marble stele, found at Paros (probably carried there from Delos). H (max.) 0.45 m; w: 0.54 m; d: 0.17 m.

Hiller von Gaertringen, *IG* XII.5.128; *Roussel, *IG* XI.1065 (A and B).

B: The lower part of the same stele, discovered at Delos. W (max.): 0.325 m; originally perhaps 0.56 m.

Böckh, *CIG* 2265; E. L. Hicks, *JHS* 11 (1890) pp. 260f., no. 4; Berard 28; Hiller von Gaertringen, *IG* XII.5, p. 308, *add.* to no. 128; *Roussel, *IG* XI.1065 (A and B).

Sonne 15, 59; M. Holleaux, *REG* 10 (1897) p. 165; A. Wilhelm, *JÖAI* 8 (1905) p. 289; Hitzig 31; Phillipson, p. 144; Raeder 31, 63; Tod 45; E. Ziebarth, *IG* XII.9, p. 157; Wilhelm, *Neue Beiträge* 6, p. 15; Steinwenter, pp. 188f., 194; de Taube, p. 46; Hiller von Gaertringen, *IG* XII supp., p. 105; Robert, *REG* 1944, 138; Wilhelm, *GIRI,* pp. 44–46, no. 12; Robert, *REG* 1953, 100, 159; *SEG* XIII.444; P. Herrmann, *MDAI(I)* 29 (1979) pp. 262f.

A - - - - - - - - - 6 lines missing - - - - - - - - - - - -
- -NTOϒ- - - - -
- -MIIII- - - - -
- . . ος καὶ Κρι[τί]-
[ας? - - φέροντες τὰ γρ]άμματα π[ρ]οσήλθ[ο]σαν πρὸς
[τ]ὴν βουλὴν κ[α]ὶ τ[ὴ]ν ἐκκλησίαν αἰτούμενοι τὸ δικαστ[ή]-
ριον κοινῆι· ψηφισαμένου δὲ τοῦ δήμου κληροῦν δικασ-
τ[ὰ]ς τριακοσίους καὶ ἕνα, ὅσους συνεχώρησαν πρὸς

3. Robertson, p. 266. Cf., however, **54**, the arbitration of a land dispute between Gonnoi and Herakleion, both communities at that time under the aegis of Macedon and Philip V. It is true that in that case the arbitration was also carried out by Macedonian authority, but there is nothing to say that such authority could not have been delegated in this case, perhaps to another Arkadian town.

arbitration."[3] A similar objection is brought against the period 199/8 to c. 194/3, during which Alipheira was incorporated in Megalopolis. Robertson finds the most reasonable conjecture for a date to be after 194/3, when Philopoimen detached a number of Arkadian towns, including Alipheira, from Megalopolis (Plut. *Phil.* 13).

83. An Eretrian arbitration between Naxos and Paros (194–166)

Two fragments (A and B), recognized as belonging to the same inscription by Wilhelm (*JÖAI* 8 [1905]).

A: The upper part of a marble stele, found at Paros (probably carried there from Delos). H (max.) 0.45 m; w: 0.54 m; d: 0.17 m.

Hiller von Gaertringen, *IG* XII.5.128; *Roussel, *IG* XI.1065 (A and B).

B: The lower part of the same stele, discovered at Delos. W (max.): 0.325 m; originally perhaps 0.56 m.

Böckh, *CIG* 2265; E. L. Hicks, *JHS* 11 (1890) pp. 260f., no. 4; Berard 28; Hiller von Gaertringen, *IG* XII.5, p. 308, *add.* to no. 128; *Roussel, *IG* XI.1065 (A and B).

Sonne 15, 59; M. Holleaux, *REG* 10 (1897) p. 165; A. Wilhelm, *JÖAI* 8 (1905) p. 289; Hitzig 31; Phillipson, p. 144; Raeder 31, 63; Tod 45; E. Ziebarth, *IG* XII.9, p. 157; Wilhelm, *Neue Beiträge* 6, p. 15; Steinwenter, pp. 188f., 194; de Taube, p. 46; Hiller von Gaertringen, *IG* XII supp., p. 105; Robert, *REG* 1944, 138; Wilhelm, *GIRI,* pp. 44–46, no. 12; Robert, *REG* 1953, 100, 159; *SEG* XIII.444; P. Herrmann, *MDAI(I)* 29 (1979) pp. 262f.

A - - - - - - - - - 6 lines missing - - - - - - - - - - - -
- -NTOϒ- - - - -
- -MIIII- - - - -
- . . ος καὶ Κρι[τί]-
[ας? - - φέροντες τὰ γρ]άμματα π[ρ]οσήλθ[ο]σαν πρὸς
[τ]ὴν βουλὴν κ[α]ὶ τ[ὴ]ν ἐκκλησίαν αἰτούμενοι τὸ δικαστ[ή]-
ριον κοινῆι· ψηφισαμένου δὲ τοῦ δήμου κληροῦν δικασ-
τ[ὰ]ς τριακοσίους καὶ ἕνα, ὅσους συνεχώρησαν πρὸς

3. Robertson, p. 266. Cf., however, **54**, the arbitration of a land dispute between Gonnoi and Herakleion, both communities at that time under the aegis of Macedon and Philip V. It is true that in that case the arbitration was also carried out by Macedonian authority, but there is nothing to say that such authority could not have been delegated in this case, perhaps to another Arkadian town.

αὐτοὺς οἱ ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων τῶμ πόλεων ἐπήκοοι, εἰσήγον-
[το] αἱ δίκαι καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῶι δικαστηρίωι σύλλυσις
[εὐδοκ]ησάντων τῶμ παρόντων ἐξ ἑκατέρας τῆς πόλε-
[ως· ὅπως οὖν καὶ ὑμεῖς] παρακολουθῆτε τὰ ὠικονομημένα ὑ-
[πὸ τῶν δικαστῶν, τό τε ἀντ]ίγραφον [δια]πεπόμφαμεν

B [- - - - - - - - - καθάπερ τοῖς Ἐρετριέων δικαστ]αῖ̣ς ἔ[δο]-
[ξεν καὶ τοῖς ἐπηκόοις τοῖς παρὰ Παρίων καὶ π]αρὰ Ναξίων ἀφε-
[σταλμένοις περὶ ὧν πρὸς τοὺς Ναξίους δ]εδικασμένοι εἰσὶν οἱ
[Πάριοι· μηδεμίαν εἶναι μηκέτι δίκην τ]οῖς ἰδιώταις ἐκ τῶν
[πρότερον γεγενημένων ἐγκλημάτω]ν ἢ ἀδικημάτων ταῖς πόλε-
[σιν· μηδεμίαν δὲ εἶναι μη]κ̣έτι δίκην κατὰ τῆς πόλεως τῆς
[Ναξίων ὑπὸ τῆς πόλεως τ]ῆς Παρίων, μηδ' ὑπὸ Ναξίων
[πόλεως κατὰ τῆς Παρίω]ν· μηδὲ ὀφείλημα μηδ' ἔγκλημα
[μηδ' ἀδίκημα εἶναι μ]ηθὲν μηδ' ἰδιώτει μηθένι κατὰ
[τῶν πόλεων, μηδὲ κατ' ἰδι]ώτου ἔγκλημα μηθὲν ἐκ τῶν πρό-
[τερον γεγενημένων αὐτῶι] πρὸς αὐτὰς ἐγκλημάτων ἢ ἀ[δι]-
[κημάτων· ἔτι δὲ ἐκέλε]υσεν τὸ Ἐρετριέων δικαστήρι[ον]
[θῦσαι βοῦν τὴν πόλιν τ]ὴν Παρίων τοῦ ἐπιτιμίου τοῦ ἐ[πι]-
[γεγραμμένου ἐν τῆιδε τῆι] γραφῆι, τὴν δὲ θυσίαν τῶι Δι[ο]-
[νύσωι τῶι Ναξίωι ἄγειν Παρ]ίους, τὸ δὲ γέρας τοῦ βοὸς εἶ[ναι]
- - - - - - - - - - - - ὁ̣ποτέρα δ' ἂν τῶν πόλεων ἢ ἰδ[ιώ]-
[της ἐναντίον τι ποιῆι τῆ]ιδε τῆι συλλύσει ἀποτεισάτω τί-
[μημα - - - - - - - - ἐὰν] μὲν πόλις παραβῆι, τάλαντα εἴκοσι
[ἀποτινέσθω δίκη, ἐὰν δὲ] ἰδιώτης τάλαντα πέντε δίκη· ἵν[α]
[δὲ - - - - - - - - - τὴν σύλ]λυσιν γεγενημένην ἐκ τῶν ἐπα-
[- - - - - - - - - - πέ]μπτης ἀπιόντος τοῦ Ἱππιῶνος μη-
[νὸς ἐπὶ τῶν στρατηγῶν?] τῶμ μετὰ Ἀρχεβίου ὡς Ἐρετριεῖς
[ἄγουσιν, ὡς δὲ Νάξιοι ἐπὶ ἱερ]έως τοῦ Διονύσου Φιλοκρίτου τοῦ
[- - - - - μηνὸς - - - -]νος, ὡς δὲ Πάριοι ἐπ' ἄρχοντος Θου-
[- - - - - - - - - - μην]ὸς Πλυντηριῶνος· τοὺς δὲ προ-
[βούλους καὶ τοὺς στρατη]γοὺς τοὺς Ἐρετριέων εἶς τε τὰ δ[η]-
[μόσια γράμματα παρ' ἑαυτ]οῖς ἀναγράψαι τήνδε τὴν σύλλυς[ιν]
[καὶ ταῖς πόλεσιν αὐτὴν ἀπο]στεῖλ[α]ι σφραγισαμένους τῆι δ[η]-
[μοσίαι σφραγῖδι· κομίσασθ]αι δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἐπηκόους ἑκατέ-
[ρας τῶν πόλεων τήνδε τ]ὴν σύλλυσιν.

B: 17–18: τί|[μημα τῷ θεῷ τῷ Δηλίῳ]: Hicks, Hiller von Gaertringen. τί|[μημα τῆι ἑτέραι πόλει]: Wilhelm, *GIRI*. || 18–19: τάλαντα εἴκοσι| [ἀργυρίου Ἀττικοῦ]: Wilhelm, *GIRI*. || 19–21: ἵν[α| κυρίαν ἔχωσιν τήνδε τὴν σύλ]λυσιν γεγενημένην ἐκ τῶν ἐπα|[κτῶν εἰς Δῆλον δικαστῶν ἀπὸ πέ]μπτης κτλ.: Hicks, Hiller von Gaertringen. δίκηι ν[ι|κηθέντες. εἶναι δὲ τὴν σύλ]λυσιν γεγενημένην ἐκ τῶν ἐπά|[νω δικαστῶν κυρίαν ἀπὸ πέ]μπτης κτλ.: Wilhelm, *GIRI*. || 22: [ἀρχόντων]: Hicks, Hiller von Gaertringen. || 25–26: τοὺς δὲ προ|[στάτας?]: Hicks. τοὺς δὲ προ|[βούλους]: Wilhelm, *AE* 1892. || 29: [κομίς]αι: Hicks. [κομίσασθ]αι: Wilhelm, *JÖAI* 8. || 29–30: ἑκατέ|[ρων]: Hicks. ἑκατέ|[ρας τῆς πόλεως]: Wilhelm, *JÖAI* 8.

The first text cited above is a decree of the Eretrians regarding an arbitration that they performed between the islands of Paros and Naxos. Embassies had come from the two states requesting a tribunal. This court was chosen by lot from among the people, and as was often the case with this democratic process, the court was quite large. The tribunal of 301 judges would have emphasized equity rather than expertise. The delegates from the two litigant states brought their cases before this court,[1] which effected a settlement between them, apparently with the agreement of the two parties, rather than resorting to a formal judgement. The Eretrians then sent out copies of their decision, one each to Naxos and Paros, and one presumably also to Delos, the provenance of this inscription.[2] The second text is a copy of this Eretrian decision. No past charges or claims or suits were to have any future validity, because they had been settled by the Eretrians. This interdiction was to apply to all suits between individual citizens, and between individual and city, as well as to suits between the two states (lines 6–8). Rather than provide for future litigation, the Eretrians instead instituted a fine for anyone transgressing the terms of the settlement, individual or city. This fine, 20 talents for a city, and 5 for an individual, was to go to the injured party.[3]

We do not know the subject of the dispute between Naxos and Paros, although it appears that Paros may have brought the original suit or suits (lines 3–4). We can assume that there were numerous disputes between their citizens in addition to some disagreement between the states themselves.[4] Hicks suggested that it might have to do with fishing rights, but this is only speculation. Neither do we know in whose favour the case was settled, although most scholars agree that Paros won its point, and a penalty was assessed against Naxos; from this amount Paros was to use a sum to make a sacrifice to the Naxian Dionysos.[5]

84. The Aitolians and Rome discuss mediation (192)

I: Livy 35.32.6–7 and 12–14.
II: Livy 35.33.4–7.

1. For the ἐπήκοοι, cf. **71**.

2. Delos, like the other important sanctuaries, also acted as a place of publication for international agreements. In this case Delos may also have acted as a venue for the tribunal itself, if the suggested restoration of line 21 is correct (see *apparatus*). See Tod, p. 101.

3. Wilhelm, *GIRI*, p. 45, who compares **67**. Cf. also **28**, **42**, **47**, **48**, **71**, **138**.

4. Steinwenter, pp. 188f.

5. Hicks (*JHS* 11, p. 261), Berard, Raeder; based on lines 12–15. Nevertheless, it seems possible that Naxos could have been the one to have won the case, and Paros was therefore supposed to sacrifice to the Naxian god as atonement; in this case, ἐπιτίμιον would refer to the price set (by the judges?) for the sacrifice.

The first text cited above is a decree of the Eretrians regarding an arbitration that they performed between the islands of Paros and Naxos. Embassies had come from the two states requesting a tribunal. This court was chosen by lot from among the people, and as was often the case with this democratic process, the court was quite large. The tribunal of 301 judges would have emphasized equity rather than expertise. The delegates from the two litigant states brought their cases before this court,[1] which effected a settlement between them, apparently with the agreement of the two parties, rather than resorting to a formal judgement. The Eretrians then sent out copies of their decision, one each to Naxos and Paros, and one presumably also to Delos, the provenance of this inscription.[2] The second text is a copy of this Eretrian decision. No past charges or claims or suits were to have any future validity, because they had been settled by the Eretrians. This interdiction was to apply to all suits between individual citizens, and between individual and city, as well as to suits between the two states (lines 6–8). Rather than provide for future litigation, the Eretrians instead instituted a fine for anyone transgressing the terms of the settlement, individual or city. This fine, 20 talents for a city, and 5 for an individual, was to go to the injured party.[3]

We do not know the subject of the dispute between Naxos and Paros, although it appears that Paros may have brought the original suit or suits (lines 3–4). We can assume that there were numerous disputes between their citizens in addition to some disagreement between the states themselves.[4] Hicks suggested that it might have to do with fishing rights, but this is only speculation. Neither do we know in whose favour the case was settled, although most scholars agree that Paros won its point, and a penalty was assessed against Naxos; from this amount Paros was to use a sum to make a sacrifice to the Naxian Dionysos.[5]

84. The Aitolians and Rome discuss mediation (192)

I: Livy 35.32.6–7 and 12–14.
II: Livy 35.33.4–7.

1. For the ἐπήκοοι, cf. **71**.

2. Delos, like the other important sanctuaries, also acted as a place of publication for international agreements. In this case Delos may also have acted as a venue for the tribunal itself, if the suggested restoration of line 21 is correct (see *apparatus*). See Tod, p. 101.

3. Wilhelm, *GIRI*, p. 45, who compares **67**. Cf. also **28**, **42**, **47**, **48**, **71**, **138**.

4. Steinwenter, pp. 188f.

5. Hicks (*JHS* 11, p. 261), Berard, Raeder; based on lines 12–15. Nevertheless, it seems possible that Naxos could have been the one to have won the case, and Paros was therefore supposed to sacrifice to the Naxian god as atonement; in this case, ἐπιτίμιον would refer to the price set (by the judges?) for the sacrifice.

III: Livy 35.45.2–8.

Matthaei, *CQ*, p. 260; Ferguson, *Athens*, pp. 282–83; Larsen, *GFS*, pp. 411–12; D. Golan, *RivSA* 7 (1977) p. 318; Gruen, pp. 104, 118.

I: Livy 35.32.6–7 and 12–14

Tamen non ab re esse Quinctio visum est sociorum aliquos legatos interesse ei concilio, qui admonerent Romanae societatis Aetolos, qui vocem liberam mittere adversus regis legatum auderent. (7) Athenienses maxime in eam rem idonei visi sunt et propter civitatis dignitatem et vetustam societatem cum Aetolis. ab iis Quinctius petit ut legatos ad Panaetolicum concilium mitterent. . . . (12) Athenienses, quibus primis post regiam legationem dicendi quae vellent potestas facta est, mentione omni regis praetermissa Romanae societatis Aetolos meritorumque in universam Graeciam T. Quincti admonuerunt: (13) ne temere eam nimia celeritate consiliorum everterent; consilia calida et audacia prima specie laeta, tractatu dura, eventu tristia esse. legatos Romanos, et in iis T. Quinctium, haud procul inde abesse; (14) dum integra omnia essent, verbis potius de iis quae ambigerentur disceptarent quam Asiam Europamque ad funestum armarent bellum.

II: Livy 35.33.4–7

Postquam ventum est eo, Quinctius in concilio orsus a principio societatis Aetolorum cum Romanis, et quotiens ab iis fides mota foederis esset, pauca de iure civitatium de quibus ambigeretur disseruit: (5) si quid tamen aequi se habere arbitrarentur, quanto esse satius Romam mittere legatos, (6) seu disceptare seu rogare senatum mallent, quam populum Romanum cum Antiocho lanistis Aetolis non sine magno motu generis humani et pernicie Graeciae dimicare?. . . (7) haec nequiquam velut vaticinatus Romanus. Thoas deinde ceterique factionis eiusdem cum adsensu omnium auditi pervicerunt ut ne dilato quidem concilio et absentibus Romanis decretum fieret, quo accerseretur Antiochus ad liberandam Graeciam disceptandumque inter Aetolos et Romanos.

III: Livy 35.45.2–8

Post discessum regis inter duos principes Aetolorum, Phaeneam et Thoantem, contentio fuit. (3) Phaeneas reconciliatore pacis et disceptatore de iis quae in controversia cum populo Romano essent utendum potius Antiocho censebat quam duce belli. . . . (5) Thoas negare paci studere Phaeneam, sed discutere apparatum belli velle, ut taedio et impetus relanguescat regis et Romani tempus ad comparandum habeant: (6) nihil enim aequi ab Romanis impetrari posse totiens legationibus missis Romam, totiens cum ipso Quinctio disceptando satis expertum esse, nec nisi abscisa omni spe auxilium Antiochi imploraturos fuisse. . . . (8) armatum regem aliquid impetraturum; inermem non pro Aetolis modo, sed ne pro se quidem ipso momenti ullius futurum apud Romanos.

By 192 a new Roman war in Greece and the East seemed inevitable. Livy records some attempts at mediation to avert this war, but it seems clear that the notion of third-party settlement at this time was at least in part exploited by both the Aitolians and the Romans as political propaganda rather than being a sincere attempt to avert the conflict.[1] Flamininus made use of Athenian support for Rome by inducing the Athenians to speak before the Aitolians, urging the Aitolians not to form ties with Antiochos but rather to submit their grievances with Rome to arbitration. The Athenians, Flamininus believed, were well placed, as old friends of Aitolia, to act in this capacity; nevertheless they failed to persuade the Aitolians to their point of view, and Flamininus himself was forced to address the Aitolian council. He too invited them to arbitration; however, that the Roman notion of arbitration of a dispute differed greatly from the Greek is made clear by the fact that Flamininus made only a formal distinction between arbitration and appeal to the senate (Livy 35.33.6: *seu disceptare seu rogare senatum mallent*).[2] Although Flamininus distinguishes between the formal procedures, it appears that as far as the Romans were concerned it really would have made no difference. Under the present circumstances, the Romans were unlikely to submit to neutral, objective third-party arbitration; and the Roman senate could scarcely be said to be the true arbitrator of a quarrel in which Rome itself was concerned.

The Aitolian response was a propaganda manoeuvre not unlike that of the Romans. They pronounced themselves willing to accept arbitration, but in a manner wholly unacceptable (and presumably calculated to be so) to the Romans: they decreed that Antiochos be invited to arbitrate between Rome and Aitolia. This decree, and the concomitant invitation to Antiochos to "liberate" Greece, ensured that Rome and Aitolia would go to war. Still, it seems that not all the Aitolians looked upon the decision to call in Antiochos as a mediator with cynicism. Livy reports dissension within Aitolian ranks: Phaeneas, the Aitolian strategos for 192/1, later argued in favour of sincerely accepting Antiochos as a mediator between Aitolia and Rome. His arguments, however, carried no weight against those of Thoas, another of the leading Aitolians. Thoas asserted, and surely with some justification, that Rome would not accept a pacific Antiochos as a mediator: in order to impress Rome, unfamiliar with the Greek notion of arbitration, Antiochos would have to appear as a formidable military power, not as a judge. But of course, as a dictator who backed his settlement with the implicit threat of force, Antiochos would be even less acceptable to Rome than as a neutral pacific arbitrator.

1. This material no doubt derives from Polybios. For further mediation in the war between Rome and Aitolia, see **94**.

2. See Gruen, p. 104; and Golan, p. 318. Cf. the arbitration proposals that Rome made to Philip V prior to and in the course of the Second Macedonian War (**59**, **72**).

85. Kassopa and Thyrrheion arbitrate between Boiotian Aigosthena and Achaian Pagai (c. 192)

Two inscriptions from the area of Pagai in the Megarid, recognized as parts of the same document by L. Robert. A: upper right-hand portion of the stele; B: lower left-hand portion.

Dittenberger, *IG* VII.188 (A), 189 (B); Berard 14 (B), 23 (A); *L. Robert, *RPh* 3.13 (1939) pp. 97–122, no. 1 (A and B); *SEG* XIII.327 (after Robert).

Sonne 24 (A), 34 (B); Raeder 43 (A), 62 (B); Swoboda, *Klio* 12 (1912) p. 33; Tod 16 (B), 29 (A); Robert, *REG* 1939, 126–27; M. Feyel, *Polybe et l'histoire de Béotie* (Paris, 1942) pp. 30–32; E. Bikerman, *REG* 56 (1943) p. 291 n. 1; Robert, *REG* 1960, 142; P. Roesch, *Thespies et le confédération béotienne* (Paris, 1965) p. 68; Robert, *REG* 1967, 284.

[Μ ε γ] α ρ [έ ω ν]
[. . c. 20 . . ἐπὶ β]ασιλέος Ἀπολλωνίδα, μηνὸς Παν[άμου . . . . . .]
[ὡς Μεγαρεῖς ἄγοντι, ἐπὶ δὲ γραμμ]ατέος τοῖς Ἀχαιοῖς Στράτωνος Με . .
. . . . . .
[. . c. 25 . . τ]οῦ Θεδώρου, Πύθωνος τοῦ Πυθοδώρο[υ, ...]
. . . . c. 27 . . . .c τοῦ Καλλιγείτου· ἐπειδὴ, ἀν[τιποιηςα]-
[μένων Αἰγοσθενιτᾶν τε καὶ Παγαί]ων τοῦ τε λιμένος τοῦ Πανόρμου καὶ .
. . . . . .
. . c. 10 . ., πρεσβευτὰς ἀπέστειλ]αν οἵ τε Ἀχαιοὶ καὶ οἱ Βοιωτοὶ ποτὶ τὰ[ν πόλιν]
[τῶν Θυρρείων καὶ ποτὶ τὰν τῶν Καςςωπα]ίων ὅπως ἀποστείλωντι ἑκάτεροι [δικας]-
[τὰς ἄνδρας - - (number) - - αἱρε]τοὺς πλουτίνδα καὶ ἀριστίνδα, οἵτιν[ες . . .]
. . . c. 29 . . . περὶ τῶν τόπων ὧν ἀντεποιήςαντο Αἰ[γος]-
[θενῖται καὶ Παγαῖοι πρὸς ἀλλήλους], οἵ τε Θυρρεῖς καὶ οἱ Καςςωπαῖοι τοὺς ἀρί[ς]-
το[υς τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἀπέστειλαν· ἑλομέν]ων δὲ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν ἐπὶ τὰγ κρίςιν τοὺς τὰν [εὖ]-
νοιαν [τοῦ ἔθνους . . c. 17 . .] ὁστρατον Νικάνδρου, Αἰνηςίωνα Ξέν[ω]-
νος, ΣΙ . . c. 28 . . υ, Ἀντίφιλον Διοκκέος, Δαμοτίωνα Ἀ[ρις]-
τοδίκου [. . c. 21 . . ὑπὲ]ρ Ἀχαιῶν, καὶ ἄνδρας οἵτινες διαβ[ου]-
λεύςονται[ι περὶ . . c. 14 . . μετὰ τῶν Πα]γαίων καὶ βοαθοήςοντι αὐτοῖς [εὐνό]-
[ω]ς περὶ τοῦ . . . c. 29 . . . ίου, Φειδόλαον Δαιτιφάν[του],
Στρατίον Λ . . . c. 30 . . . τ̣ου, Ἀρέαν Πευθέα, Ἐπι . . . .
Λαcθένεος, . . . c. 30 . . . υ, Μνακικλῆ Ἐπιμ[άχου?, Κρα?]-
τίδαν Cατύρο[υ . . . c. 30 . . . B]οίcκον Ὀνακίμου . . . . . .
Ἄρχιππον Ἀριcτ . . ., c. 30 . ., . . Λ̣υκίcκου, Αἰγ . . . . . .
νωνα Cθένωνος, Καλ . . . . c. 30 . . . . ΔΑΜΩΝΙΙΟ . . . . . .
τᾶς δὲ τῶν Cικυωνίων π̣ό̣[λεως ἀποστειλάcης]-ΜΑΤ . . c. 10 . .

ξενον Cωτίμου διὰ τὰν ε[ὔνοιαν καὶ φιλίαν ἃν ἔχουca διατελεῖ διὰ παν]-
[τ]ὸc ποτὶ τὰμ πόλιν ἁμῶν, [οἱ ἀποcταλέντες ἄνδρες παραγενόμενοι εἰc? τοὺc τό]-
πουc τοὺc ἀντιλεγομένουc [- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - ἀπεδείξαντο?]
τὰν εὔνοιαν τᾶι πόλει ἁμῶν [καὶ ἀνεστράφηcαν? - - - ὡc καὶ ἀξίωc τῶν Ἀχαιῶν]
καὶ τᾶc πόλιοc τῶν Cικυωνίων cυ- -
τῶν ἀνδρῶν δικαίωc καὶ εὐόρκωc· ἔδοξ[ε βουλᾶι καὶ δάμωι· ἐπαινέcαι μὲν τοὺc]
ἄρχοντας τῶν Ἀχαιῶν καὶ τοὺc Ἀχαιοὺc [ὅτι τοὺc - - - - - - - - - - - - καὶ εὐνο]-
οῦντας τῶι ἔθνει οὐκ ἐνκαταλείποντι [- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - ἀλλὰ]
διαcώιζοντι ἐν τοῖc μεγίcτοιc κινδύνο[ι]c [καὶ φόβοιc?· ἐπαινέcαι δὲ καὶ τὰν]
πόλιν τῶν Cικυωνίων ὅτι διαμένει καὶ δια[φ]υλ[άccουca τὰν ὑπάρχουcαν φιλίαν]
καὶ εὔνοιαν διὰ παντὸc ποτὶ τὰν πόλιν ἁμῶν· ὡ[cαύτωc δὲ καὶ ἐπαινέcαι?]
καὶ τοὺc ἀποcταλέντας ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν κ[αὶ τῶν Cικυωνίων cυνεγδίκουc? τοὺc]
βοαθοήcαντας τᾷ[ι πό]λει εὐνόωc κατὰ τὸ δίκαιο[ν· δεδόcθαι δὲ αὐτοῖc καὶ προξε]-
νίαν καὶ ἀναγρά[ψαι ἐν] τὰν αὐτὰν cτάλαν ἐν ἃι καὶ [τὸ γενόμενον κρίμα γεγραμ]-
μένον ἐcτί· εἶμε[ν δὲ αὐ]τοῖc καὶ ἀτέλειαν ὧν τε κ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
. . . . ι κ̣αὶ ἐ̣ν τ̣ο̣[ῖc ἀγῶ]cι προεδρίαν καὶ ἐξουcία[ν - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
- - - - - - - - - - -ντι Παγαῖοι· δίδοcθαι δὲ α̣[ὐτοῖc - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
- - - - - - - - - - - - - ὅπωc εἰδῶ[ντι -]

Prior to Robert's careful reading of these fragments, it was thought that the two pieces of the stone, discovered separately, represented evidence for two different cases of arbitration.[1] It seems clear, however, from Robert's persuasive reexamination, that the fragments belong to the same inscription. The stone records an honorary decree promulgated by Megara on behalf of the town of Pagai for Achaian and Sikyonian advocates in a case involving disputed territory in the Megarid on the Gulf of Corinth. Although the inscription does not appear to record the details of the actual judgement, it does give some interesting background to the case. The small towns of Aigosthena and Pagai were in dispute over Panormos, a harbour, and its surrounding territory, which lay between their respective frontiers.[2] Aigosthena, a town generally linked to Megara, appears at this juncture to have been part of the Boiotian League, while

1. *IG* VII.188 (Sonne 24; Tod 29; Berard 23; Raeder 43); *IG* VII.189 (Sonne 34; Tod 16; Berard 14; Raeder 62). Interpretations of the fragments varied greatly as to the identity of the disputants, the object of dispute, and the arbitrators.

2. On the topography of the region see S. van de Maele, *EMC* 33 (1989) pp. 183–88.

Pagai (and Megara presumably) were members of the Achaian League.[3] Under the circumstances, it is perhaps not surprising that this arbitration was referred outside the provenance of both leagues.[4] The Achaians and the Boiotians, both acting as advocates for their respective members, Pagai and Aigosthena, turned to the Akarnanian town of Thyrrheion and the Epirote town of Kassopa. These two towns agreed to send judges, men chosen for the task on an aristocratic basis. The Achaians thereupon acted as advocates for Pagai in the trial, nominating the Achaian city of Sikyon to undertake this duty. Presumably the Boiotians did the same for Aigosthena. This decree provides us with an interesting example of the procedure that could be followed when the dispute involved two members of different federal states. It must be admitted that the fragmented state of the inscription, and the fact that it obviously does not record all information pertinent to the case, may be misleading. As far as we can tell, however, the agreement arrived at between the federal governments (if not between the two individual states) was fairly amicable.

86. Flamininus intervenes between the Achaian League and Messene (191)

Livy 36.31.9.

Aymard, *PR*, pp. 338f.; Roebuck, Diss., pp. 91f.; Errington, *Philopoemen*, pp. 122f.; Will, vol. 2, p. 208; Bastini, pp. 76f.

> Messeniis imperavit ut exules reducerent et Achaeorum concilii essent; si qua haberent de quibus aut recusare aut in posterum caveri sibi vellent, Corinthum ad se venirent.

Towards the end of the Roman war against Aitolia, the Achaians decided to use the opportunity to incorporate Elis and Messene. Messene was prepared to resist, but the Achaian strategos Diophanes and the League army invaded Messenian territory. As a last resort, the Messenians sent an embassy to Flamininus at Chalkis to offer him the *deditio* of their city (Livy 36.31.1–5). Flamininus agreed to intervene, contacting Diophanes and telling him to withdraw his army from the territory of Messene. He met with the strategos at Andania and ordered

3. Robert dates the inscription to the circumstances of 192. Since it is clear from the inscription that Megara was part of the Achaian League, the arbitration should be dated to before 224, or after 192. The hostility implied between Megara-Pagai and Aigosthena, a member of the Boiotian League, suggests the latter date. Megara's entry into the Boiotian League in 224 was undertaken peacefully, with the agreement of the Achaian League; but its departure in 192 resulted in hostilities (Polyb. 20.6).

4. We find the same principle applied in **118**.

Pagai (and Megara presumably) were members of the Achaian League.[3] Under the circumstances, it is perhaps not surprising that this arbitration was referred outside the provenance of both leagues.[4] The Achaians and the Boiotians, both acting as advocates for their respective members, Pagai and Aigosthena, turned to the Akarnanian town of Thyrrheion and the Epirote town of Kassopa. These two towns agreed to send judges, men chosen for the task on an aristocratic basis. The Achaians thereupon acted as advocates for Pagai in the trial, nominating the Achaian city of Sikyon to undertake this duty. Presumably the Boiotians did the same for Aigosthena. This decree provides us with an interesting example of the procedure that could be followed when the dispute involved two members of different federal states. It must be admitted that the fragmented state of the inscription, and the fact that it obviously does not record all information pertinent to the case, may be misleading. As far as we can tell, however, the agreement arrived at between the federal governments (if not between the two individual states) was fairly amicable.

86. Flamininus intervenes between the Achaian League and Messene (191)

Livy 36.31.9.

Aymard, *PR*, pp. 338f.; Roebuck, Diss., pp. 91f.; Errington, *Philopoemen*, pp. 122f.; Will, vol. 2, p. 208; Bastini, pp. 76f.

> Messeniis imperavit ut exules reducerent et Achaeorum concilii essent; si qua haberent de quibus aut recusare aut in posterum caveri sibi vellent, Corinthum ad se venirent.

Towards the end of the Roman war against Aitolia, the Achaians decided to use the opportunity to incorporate Elis and Messene. Messene was prepared to resist, but the Achaian strategos Diophanes and the League army invaded Messenian territory. As a last resort, the Messenians sent an embassy to Flamininus at Chalkis to offer him the *deditio* of their city (Livy 36.31.1–5). Flamininus agreed to intervene, contacting Diophanes and telling him to withdraw his army from the territory of Messene. He met with the strategos at Andania and ordered

3. Robert dates the inscription to the circumstances of 192. Since it is clear from the inscription that Megara was part of the Achaian League, the arbitration should be dated to before 224, or after 192. The hostility implied between Megara-Pagai and Aigosthena, a member of the Boiotian League, suggests the latter date. Megara's entry into the Boiotian League in 224 was undertaken peacefully, with the agreement of the Achaian League; but its departure in 192 resulted in hostilities (Polyb. 20.6).

4. We find the same principle applied in **118**.

him to disband his army and reproached him for disrupting the Peloponnesian peace without seeking Roman authorization first.[1] The Roman commander then went on to put an end to the dispute between Messene and the League. The League, in spite of Flamininus's sharp words to Diophanes, received the major benefit from the settlement: Messene was to join Achaia and abandon its claim to certain territories, such as Asine and Pylos,[2] retaining only Thouria, Abia, and Pharae.[3] Flamininus also instructed the Messenians to recall their exiles. Messene might have hoped for better when it decided to offer *deditio* to Rome. The restoration of exiles, as always, was bound to cause difficulties. Flamininus did, however, offer a safeguard: if any disputes arose over his settlement, or if the Messenians thought any problems would arise, they were to come to him at Corinth for arbitration. Nevertheless, this was scarcely the equivalent of an arbitration clause in a treaty. Rather it was an arrangement that relied on Flamininus's personal prestige and was limited by the temporary nature of his presence.

87. Corinthian judges carry out an arbitration for Elis and an unknown state (after 191)

Fragment of a stele found at Kokkinovrysi near Corinth. H: 0.21 m; w: 0.225 m; d: 0.085 m-0.10 m.

*N. D. Robertson, *Hesperia* 45 (1976) pp. 253–66; *SEG* XXVI.392 (after Robertson).

N. D. Robertson *AJA* 68 (1964) p. 200; *SEG* XXII.231; Robert, *REG* 1977, 188; Gruen, p. 109.

[- ἔδοξε τοῖρ cυνέδροιρ, ἐπαινέ?]-
[cαι μὲν τὸν δᾶμον τῶν Κορινθίων καὶ cτεφανῶcαι cτεφάνωι χρυcέωι ἐπὶ?]
[τ]ᾶι καλοκα[γαθίαι καὶ τᾶι εὐνοίαι ἃι ποτ ἀμὲ ἔχων διατελεῖ·? ἐπαινέcαι]
δὲ καὶ τοῖρ δικαcταῖρ διοιχ[άcαντερ πάντα φιλοδόξωρ καὶ δικαίωρ καὶ?]
ἀξίωρ τᾶρ ἐγχειριcθείcαρ αὐτοῖρ πίcτι[ο]ρ [καὶ cπουδᾶρ· ἦμεν δὲ καὶ? προξέ]-
νοιρ καὶ εὐεργέταιρ τᾶρ πόλιορ Νικοκλῆ Δια[- - - τὸν δεῖνα (c. 23) - - -ίπ]-
πω Νικάτα[ν Χ]ιωνίδα Πολύξενον Νικάνδ[ρου or ρίδα τὸν δεῖνα τοῦ δεῖνος
τὸν δεῖνα (c. 28)]
Ἀντάν[δρ]ο[υ] Ἀρχεμαχίδαν Φιλαίθω Μνacέα[ν τοῦ δεῖνος τὸν δεῖνα τοῦ
δεῖνος (c. 26)]

1. Briscoe (*Books XXXIV–XXXVII,* p. 268) suggests Flamininus was probably acting by virtue of the Messenian *deditio*. Nevertheless, the tone of the order was far from diplomatic.
2. Cf. **76**.
3. Cf. **116**; Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 3, p. 193.

him to disband his army and reproached him for disrupting the Peloponnesian peace without seeking Roman authorization first.[1] The Roman commander then went on to put an end to the dispute between Messene and the League. The League, in spite of Flamininus's sharp words to Diophanes, received the major benefit from the settlement: Messene was to join Achaia and abandon its claim to certain territories, such as Asine and Pylos,[2] retaining only Thouria, Abia, and Pharae.[3] Flamininus also instructed the Messenians to recall their exiles. Messene might have hoped for better when it decided to offer *deditio* to Rome. The restoration of exiles, as always, was bound to cause difficulties. Flamininus did, however, offer a safeguard: if any disputes arose over his settlement, or if the Messenians thought any problems would arise, they were to come to him at Corinth for arbitration. Nevertheless, this was scarcely the equivalent of an arbitration clause in a treaty. Rather it was an arrangement that relied on Flamininus's personal prestige and was limited by the temporary nature of his presence.

87. Corinthian judges carry out an arbitration for Elis and an unknown state (after 191)

Fragment of a stele found at Kokkinovrysi near Corinth. H: 0.21 m; w: 0.225 m; d: 0.085 m-0.10 m.

*N. D. Robertson, *Hesperia* 45 (1976) pp. 253–66; *SEG* XXVI.392 (after Robertson).

N. D. Robertson *AJA* 68 (1964) p. 200; *SEG* XXII.231; Robert, *REG* 1977, 188; Gruen, p. 109.

[- ἔδοξε τοῖρ cυνέδροιρ, ἐπαινέ?]-
[cαι μὲν τὸν δᾶμον τῶν Κορινθίων καὶ cτεφανῶcαι cτεφάνωι χρυcέωι ἐπὶ?]
[τ]ᾶι καλοκα[γαθίαι καὶ τᾶι εὐνοίαι ἃι ποτ ἀμὲ ἔχων διατελεῖ·? ἐπαινέcαι]
δὲ καὶ τοῖρ δικαcταῖρ διοιχ[άcαντερ πάντα φιλοδόξωρ καὶ δικαίωρ καὶ?]
ἀξίωρ τᾶρ ἐγχειριcθείcαρ αὐτοῖρ πίcτι[ο]ρ [καὶ cπουδᾶρ· ἦμεν δὲ καὶ? προξέ]-
νοιρ καὶ εὐεργέταιρ τᾶρ πόλιορ Νικοκλῆ Δια[- - - τὸν δεῖνα (c. 23) - - -ίπ]-
πω Νικάτα[ν Χ]ιωνίδα Πολύξενον Νικάνδ[ρου or ρίδα τὸν δεῖνα τοῦ δεῖνος
τὸν δεῖνα (c. 28)]
Ἀντάν[δρ]ο[υ] Ἀρχεμαχίδαν Φιλαίθω Μνacέα[ν τοῦ δεῖνος τὸν δεῖνα τοῦ
δεῖνος (c. 26)]

1. Briscoe (*Books XXXIV–XXXVII,* p. 268) suggests Flamininus was probably acting by virtue of the Messenian *deditio*. Nevertheless, the tone of the order was far from diplomatic.
2. Cf. **76**.
3. Cf. **116**; Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 3, p. 193.

Τιμοσθένη Ἀγαθανδρίδα Δικαίαρχον Δαμ[- - - - τὸν δεῖνα (c. 26) - - - -]
. δα Ἀρχέμαχον Πειθιδάμω Κ[ορ]ινθίοιρ ^{vv} [ὑπάρχην δὲ αὐτοῖρ καὶ ἐκγόνοιρ?]
χαὶ πολιτείαν καὶ ἀτέλειαν καὶ ἀσφάλε[ιαν καὶ πολέμω καὶ εἰράναρ καὶ τὰ]
λοιπὰ τίμια ὅσα κ[α]ὶ τοῖρ ἄλλοιρ προξένοιρ κ[αὶ εὐεργέταιρ ὑπάρχει·? καλέσαι δὲ]
[αὐ]τοὶρ καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ[ν κοι]νὰν ἑστίαν τοὶρ ἄρχο[ντερ· δόμεν δὲ αὐτοῖρ καὶ ξένια·?]
[τὰν δὲ ἐπιμέλειαν ποιήασσαι?] Λάδρομον τὸν ἐπιμε[λητὰν ὅπωρ τὸ ψάφισμα τόδε?]
[γραφὲν ἐγ χάλκωμα ἀνατεθᾶι? ἐν τ]ὸ ἱερὸν ⟨ἴ⟩να ἐ⟨ν⟩ πάντα τ[ὸν χρόνον διαμένηι ^{vvv} ?]

13: the stone reads ἱερον ΗΑΕ πάντα.

This text in the Eleian dialect, found at Corinth, records an honorary decree for Corinthian judges. Although the name of the state that promulgated this decree has not survived, the dialect naturally suggests Elis as the state to which the Corinthian judges were sent. As with several other cases in which our only evidence consists of the honorary decree for the judges or advocates, rather than a record of the actual judgement, it is impossible to tell what the nature of the dispute or the method of arbitration was here. The decree simply records the award of honours to the people of Corinth and the thirteen judges dispatched by them. The honours are typical of those awarded to arbitrators: they are to be proclaimed *proxenoi* and *euergetai* and are to have *politeia*, *ateleia*, *asphaleia*, and so on.

In spite of the lack of firm evidence, Robertson has speculated that this decree provides evidence for a case of international arbitration, rather than for a thank-offering for foreign judges who would have come to settle internal disputes within Elis itself.[1] If this is a case of arbitration between Elis and another state, the most obvious possibility that comes to mind is that the circumstances were those of a border dispute, particularly given the unsettled conditions of the Peloponnese around this time. The date, Robertson believes, must be after 191, the year when Elis joined the Achaian League. After becoming a member, it would have been in keeping with general League practice for Elis to turn to another member of the League to settle a dispute. The Achaian League may have required judicial resolution of outstanding conflicts as a condition of membership.[2]

1. Robertson cites Polyb. 4.73 on the generally peaceful internal situation in Elis.
2. See **38**, **43**, **44**.

88. Rome and the Delphic Amphiktyony (?) settle disputes between Amphissa, Delphi, Myania, and Antikyra (190)

The testimonia for this case consist of documents from two separate series of inscriptions from Delphi, one from the statue base of Acilius Glabrio (I) and the other from the so-called Bilingual Monument (II and III).

I: Part of the series of documents from the statue base of Glabrio. A letter (A) from Glabrio to Delphi and an enumeration of confiscations of real estate (B), engraved on the block forming the rear of the base. H: 0.76 m; w: 0.69 m-0.71 m; d: 0.57 m–0.58 m.

Dittenberger/Pomtow, *SIG*^{3} 609 (A), 610 (B); H. Pomtow, *Klio* 16 (1919) p. 123, no. 117 (A); p. 126, no. 118 (B); P. Roussel, *BCH* 56 (1932) pp. 3–5; *Sherk 37 (A and B); J.-P. Michaud, *Études delphiques* (Paris, 1977) pp. 125–36 (B); **SEG* XXVII.123 (B, after Michaud).

II: A set of inscriptions from a much later period (A.D. 116/7), from the "Bilingual Monument," which contained decrees of Avidius Nigrinus regarding the sacred land. These inscriptions may refer to a hieromnemonic decision carried out under the aegis of Glabrio in 190.

C. Moroni, *Inscriptiones seu Epigrammata Graeca et Latina reperta per Illyricum a Cyriaco Anconitano apud Liburniam* (Rome, 1747) 197 (C), 199 (B); E. Dodwell, *A Classical and Topographical Tour through Greece* II (London, 1819) pp. 510–11 (A, B, C, and D); Böckh, *CIG* 1711 A (B), B (C); LeBas/Foucart 853 a (B), 853 b (C); C. Wescher, *Étude sur le monument bilingue de Delphes* (Paris, 1869) 34 (B), 7 (C); Mommsen, *CIL* III.1.567 (B and C); de Ruggiero, pp. 232f., no. 1 A (C); Dittenberger/Pomtow, *SIG*^{3} 827 C (A), D (B), E (C), and F (D); E. M. Smallwood, *Documents Illustrating the Principates of Nerva, Trajan and Hadrian* (Cambridge, 1966) 446 (A); *A. Plassart, *FDelphes* III.4, 3.292 (A), 293 (B), 294 (C), 295 (D).

III: See also the inscription from 125 B.C. (**163**, document II, q.v. for editions), which refers to a *senatus consultum* that dedicated land to the god (**163**, II, col. C, lines 9–10), as well as to a piece of land (Nateia, also mentioned in the enumeration of confiscations [I B below]) given by Glabrio to Apollo (**163**, II, col. C, line 38).

J. Schmidt, *Hermes* 15 (1880) p. 276–78 (*CIL* III supp. [1889] p. 1317, no. 7303); de Ruggiero, pp. 65, 142, 155, 225, 369f.; E. Bourguet, *BCH* 35 (1911) pp. 461f.; Phillipson, p. 154; Tod 26; Steinwenter, p. 184; P. de la Coste-Messelière, *BCH* 50 (1926) pp. 121f.; M. Holleaux, *BCH* 54 (1930) pp. 1–41; Daux, *Delphes,* pp. 225–33, 664–70; Flacelière, pp. 356f.; Rostovtzeff, *SEHHW*, vol. 2, p. 614; Lerat, p. 74; Larsen (Frank), pp. 284–86, 311–12; Johnson et al., *ARS* 21 (A); A. Plassart, *FDelphes* III.4, 3, p. 3; Daverio Rocchi, pp. 132–42; id., *Mélanges.*

I: The inscriptions from the statue base of Glabrio

A: The letter of Glabrio to Delphi

- - - - - - - - - - - - ὑπάρχ[ει]ν [κατά]λυμα τοῖς ἡμετέροι[ς πολ]ίτα[ις. ὑμεῖς δὲ φροντίσατε]
[ἵν]α ταῦτα πάντα ἀναγραφέντα εἰς στήλην λιθίνην ἀνατεθῆι ἐν τῶ[ι ἱερῶι. ἐὰν δέ τινες ἀντι]-
[ποι]ῶνται περὶ τῶν κτήσεων ἢ τῶν ἐκ τούτων καρπῶν ἢ οἰκιῶν ἢ τῶ[ν ὑπαρχόντων, φά]-
[μεν]οι ἑαυτῶν εἶναι, περὶ τούτων, ὅσαι μὲν ἐφ' ἡμῶν γεγόναει κρίσεις, κ[ύριαι ἔστωσαν· ὑμεῖς δέ,]
5 [κριτ]ήριον ἀποδείξαντες τὸ μέλλον ὀρθῶς διαλήμψεσθαι, διεξαγάγ[ετε τὰς λοιπὰς - - - - - - -.]
. . ἤγγελται δέ μοι μερισμούς τε γίνεσθαι ἀπὸ τούτων εἴς τινας λάθρα[ι καὶ ὠνάς, ἀναφορᾶς]
[μὴ γ]ενομ[έ]νης ἐπὶ τὸ κοινόν· στοχάσασθε οὖν ὅπως μηδὲ ἓν τοιοῦτο γίνηται [τοῦ λοιποῦ. περὶ δὲ]
[τ]ῶν κατὰ τὸ ἱερόν, ἐάν τε Θεσσαλοί, ἐάν τε ἄλλοι τινὲς πρεσβεύωσι, πειρά-σο[μαι ἐν Ῥώμῃ? κατὰ]
[τ]ὰ ἐμ[α]υτοῦ φροντίσαι ἵνα ὑμῖν κατάμονα ἦι τὰ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὑπάρχοντα πάτρ[ια, σωζομένης? τῆς]
10 τῆς πόλεως καὶ τοῦ ἱεροῦ αὐτονομίας.

2–3: ἀνατεθῆι ἐν τῶι [ἱερῶι τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος -|- τὴν χρῆσιν? τῶν] τῶν λιπόντων κτήσεων: *SIG*^{3}. || 4: γεγόναει κτίσεις: *SIG*^{3}. || 5: ἡμῖν ἀποδείξαντες: *SIG*^{3}. || 4–5: [τοῦ δὲ λοιποῦ,| κριτ]ήριον ἀποδείξαντες . . ., διεξαγάγ[ετε τὸ δίκαιον: suggested by Sherk as an alternative. || 9–10: τὰ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὑπάρχοντα πάτ[ρια περὶ τῆς τε ἀσυλίας καὶ ἀνεισφορίας καὶ τῆς]| . τῆς πόλεως: *SIG*^{3}. πάτ[ρια τὰ περὶ τῆς]: suggested by Sherk as an alternative.

B: The list of property confiscations

Τὰ δεδομένα χωρία τῶι θεῶι
καὶ τ[ᾶ]ι πόλει.
3 ἐν Ὑποπλειστίαι·

There follows a list of thirteen names of persons whose property was expropriated, including four from Tolophon, one from Physkos, three from Amphissa, one from Kallipolis, one from Arsinoe, one from Tritea, and two from Chalai.

18 ἐν Λ[ι]πάραι·

Three names, one from Naupaktos, one from Plygoneion, one from Amphissa.

23 ἐν Ταθείαι·

One name, from Amphissa.

26 ἐν Βάσσαι·

One name, from Plygoneion.

28 ἐν Αἰθέαι·

Two names, from Plygoneion.

32 ἐν Νατείαι·

Three names, two from Amphissa, one from Physkos.

36 ἐν Ἀνδρέαι·

One name, from Chalai.

38 ἃς ἔδωκε οἰκίας τῶι θεῶι καὶ τᾶι [πόλει]·

Forty-six names, including four from Naupaktos, three from Tolophon, eight from Physkos, two from Herakleia, ten from Amphissa, two from Alpa, three from Chalai, four from Kallipolis, two from Dryopis, one from Arsinoe, one from Antaia, two from Triteia, one from Trichonia, one from Pleuron, one from Agrina, one from Oinoe.

18: ἐν Λιπάραι: *SIG*^{3}. Λεπάραι: Daux. || 23: ἐν Ζαθείαι: *SIG*^{3}. || 26: ἐν Βάσσαι[c]: *SIG*^{3}. || 36: ἐν Ἀνδρείαι: *SIG*^{3}.

A new fragment published in *SEG* XXVII.123 (Michaud) continues the list of expropriations, with four names listed from Tolophon, four from Oianthe, eleven from Amphissa, three from Plygoneion, one from Matropolis, one from Akyphania, one from Naupaktos, one from Bouttion (?), one from Herakleia, one from Physkos, two from Chalai, one from Kallipolis.

The inscription continues with more donations of Glabrio:

[τάδ' ἔκρινε Μάνιος Ἀκίλιο]ς στρατηγὸς
[ὕπατος Ῥωμαίων· τὰν κτῆσιν] ἃν Ῥωμαῖοι
[ἔλαβον παρὰ . . . . . .] Ἡρακλε[ι]ώτα, ταύταν
[ἐπέδωκε Μά]ν[ι]ος Ἀκίλιος στρατηγὸς
[ὕπατος Ῥωμαί]ων τᾶ[ι χώρ]αι τοῦ Ἀπόλ-
[λων]ος τ[οῦ Πυ]θίου
[τάδ]ε ἀ[πέδ]ωκ[ε] Μάνιος Ἀκίλιος στρατη-
γὸς ὕπα[τ]ος Ῥωμαίων [τ]ῶι θεῶι καὶ τᾶι
πόλει τὰ [τεμέ]νη τοῦ Ἀπόλ[λ]ωνος τοῦ
Πυθίου ᾧ[ν] εἶχον Αἰτωλ[ο]ὶ κτήσεις·
τὰν . . . . ΟΥ Ἀμ[φ]ισσέος
τὰν Λύκου Ἀμφισσέος
τ[ὰν] Ἀνδροσθενίδα Τ[ολφ]ωνίου
τὰν Κλεάνδρου Ἀμ[φι]σσέος
τὰν Ἀριστοφύλου Φ[υ]σκέος
τὰν . . . . . ΟΥ Ἀμφισσέος
τ[ὰ]ν Ἀρ[ι]στοξένου [Ἀμ]φ[ι]σσέ̣ο̣[ς]
τὰν Εὐ̣[ν]ί̣κου Φυσκέος
καὶ ᾧ ἀνέθηκε Τ̣λη̣πόλεμος Ἀρταπά-
του Λύκιος ἐν τὸ ἐλαιοχρίστιον· τὸ χω-
ρίον τὸ ἐν Ὑποπλειστίαι δ ἐπρίατο παρὰ
Ἀρχίππ[ου] καὶ τὸ χωρίον τὸ ἐμ Βάσσαι
δ ἐπρίατο παρὰ Σ̣τ̣[ρ]ατίππου· τού-

των [ἀ]πέδωκε Μ[ά]γιος Ἀκίλιος στρα[τη]-
γὸς ὕπατος Ῥωμαίων τὰν ἐπιμέλε[ι]-
αν τ[ᾶ]ι πόλει τῶν Δελφῶν
τὰ[ς δύο οἰ]κίας τὰς Πατρωνίδος Ἀμ-
φ[ισσίδος] ἔδωκε ἐν τὸ ἐλαιοχρίστιον

II: The inscriptions from the *Bilingual Monument* of A.D. 116/7

A: The border between Delphi and Amphissa-Myania

X K Octobres Elatiae [vvv] De c[o]ntroversia Delphorum adversus Amphissienses [et]
Myanenses de finibus, de q[ui]bus Optimus Princeps cognoscere me iussit, quae, au[ditis]
saepius utrisque et peragr[at]is adque inspectis secundum utriusque partis demon[stra]-
tionem locis de quibus amb[ig]ebantur, item instrumentis ad eam rem pertinentibus [perpen]-
sis, compereram, hoc decret[o c]omplexus sum. cum hieromnemonum iudicio {quod} ex auctor[itate Ma]-
ni Acili et senatus facto Op[ti]mus Princeps stari iusserit, et prolata sit apud me determinatio per h[i]-
eromnemonas facta qu[ae etia]m Delpes in latere aedis Apollinis incisa est, placet secundum eam dete[r]-
minationem: a Trin[apea, quae e]st petra imminens super vallem quam Charadron vocant in qua e[st]
fons Embat[eia, usque ad eum f]ontem, quod ad Delphos spectat finium Delphorum esse; ab eo font[e, cum]
[determinatio ad Astraba]nta fines oportere derigi demonstret, placet ad eum ter[minum,]
[qui in rupe quadam quae Astrab]as v[oca]tur non procul a mari mihi{n} ostensus est, in qu[o tripus]
[insculptus est, quod proprium esse sa]crae Delphor[u]m regionis videtur, fin[ium Delpho]-
[rum esse quod ad sinistrum usque ad mare ad Delphos verg]ens demonstratu[m est - - -]

9: fons [En]ba[teia, usque ad f]ontem: *SIG*^{3}. || 10: dirigi: *SIG*^{3}. || 11: [qui in rupe quae Astrabas] a[ppella]tur: *SIG*^{3}. || 11–13: [tripus| insculptus est qui proprius sa]crae Delphor[u]m regionis videtur fin[is esse, quod ad| Delphos spectat, finium Delphorum esse. Eo termino fini]ens demonstrat [determinatio - - -]: *SIG*^{3}.

B: The border between Delphi and Amphissa-Myania

Πρ(ὸ) ι Καλ Ὀκτωβρ [v] ἐν Ἐλατείᾳ [v] Περὶ τῆς ἀμφισβητήσεως τῆς Δελφῶν πρὸς Ἀμ-
φισσεῖς καὶ Μυανεῖς περὶ τῶν ὅρων, περὶ ἧς ὁ Μέγιστος Αὐτοκράτωρ ἐκέλευσέν

με χρεῖναι, πλεονάκις ἑκατέρων διακούσας καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν τόπων γενόμενος καὶ καταμαθὼν ἕκαστα ἐπὶ τῆς αὐτοψίας κατὰ τὴν ἀμφοτέρων ὑφήγησιν, προς-
ἔτι δὲ ἐντυχὼν τοῖς εἰς ἀπόδειξιν ὑπ' αὐτῶν προφερομένοις, ἃ ἐπέγνων ταύτῃ τῇ ἀποφάσει περιέλαβον. ˅ ἐπεὶ τὴν ὑπὸ τῶν ἱερομνημόνων γενομένην κρίσιν
[κ]ατὰ τὴν Μανίου Ἀκειλίου καὶ τῆς Συγκλήτου γνώμην, ἣν καὶ ὁ Μέγιστος Αὐ-
[τ]οκράτωρ πασῶν μάλιστα κυρίαν ἐτήρησεν, συνωμολογήθη ταύτην εἶναι τὴν
[ἐ]ν τῷ ἱερῷ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ ἐν Δελφοῖς ἐξ εὐ[ω]νύμ[ου] ε[ἰς]ι̣ό̣[ντων] ἐνκε-
[χαραγ]μένην, ἀρέσκει, κατὰ τὸν ὑπὸ τῶν ἱερομνημόνων [ἀφ]ο̣ρ[ισμὸν γενό]-μενον· ˅ ἀπὸ
[Τριναπέας ὄρ]ου, ἥτις ἐ̣στὶν πέτρα ἐ[ξ]έχουσα ὑπὲρ κοιλ[άδος] ἣν Χάραδρ[ον καλοῦσιν], ὑφ' ἣν ἔστιν
[κρήνη Ἐμβ]άτεια, κατ' εὐθὺ μέχρι τῆς προειρημένης κρήνης τ[ὸ] πρὸς [Δε]λφοὺς μέ[ρ]ος Δελφῶν
[εἶναι. ˅ ἀπὸ] τῆς κρήνης τῆς Ἐ[μβ]ατείας, ἐπειδὴ ὁ α[ὐ]τὸς ἀφορισμὸς σημαίνει [κα]τ' Ἀστράβαν-
[τα δεύτερον ὄρο]ν εἶναι, ἀρέσκει μέχρι τοῦ ὄρου τοῦ ἐν τῷ Ἀστράβαντι δεικν[υ]μένου, οὐ
[πόρρω τῆς] θαλάσση[ς, ἐ]ν ᾧ τρίπο[υ]ς ἐνκεκόλα[π]ται, ὃ [δ]οκεῖ ἴδιον εἶναι τῆς ἱερᾶς τῶν
[Δελφῶν χώρας ὅρι]ο̣ν̣, [ἅ]π[αντα] τὰ εὐώνυμα ὡς ἐπὶ θάλασσαν εἶναι Δελφῶν
[. . . c. 20 . . . ἐ]κείνου τ[οῦ ὅ]ρου ὃς ἐπεδεί[χθ]η μοι κα[τὰ? - - - - - - - - - -]
. . . . . c. 46 . . . . . νος ἐφαίνε[το -]

Another fragment (edited by Plassart, Delphi inv. no. 3935) may continue this inscription:

- - - - - a largely destroyed line - - - -
[- - - - -πε]ριαγωγὴν τὴν ε- - - - - -
- - - - - - -έταξαν οὕτως α- - - - - - -
[ἀπὸ θαλ]ά̣σσης κατὰ τὸ βραχ[ύ - - - -]
- - - - - - τοὺς ὅρους ἀπέχειν κ- - - - -
[- - - - τ]ῆς ἁλέας καθ' ὃ τελευ[τᾶι - - -]
- - - - - - τῶν ὅρων καὶ τῆς θα[λάσσης - -]
- - - - - - ἀναμφισ[β]ή̣τ̣[ητον- - - - -]

9: ἐ̣πὶ [φλιῶν]: Wescher. [εἰσιόν]των: Schmidt, Colin. || 11: [τοῦ πρώτου ὅρ]ου: Wescher. [τοῦ Ταρμ]ή̣ου: Schmidt. || 12: [κρήνη Κρ]άτεια: Wescher. || 13: τῆς Ἐλατείας: Dodwell. [εἶναι μετὰ] τῆς κ[ρήνης] τῆ̣[ς] Κρατείας: Wescher. τῆς Βατείας: Schmidt. [εἶναι. ἀπὸ] τῆς κ[ρήνης] τῆ̣[ς] Ἐ[μβ]ατείας: Colin. || 13–14: ση[μα]ίνε[ι τὸν Ἀς]τρά[βαν|τα] κτλ: Wescher. [κα]τ' Ἀστρά|[βαντα ἄλλον ὅρο]ν: Schmidt. || 15: ο[ὗ| πόρρω θαλάσσης]: *SIG*^{3}. || 16: [Δελφῶν χώρας κατ' ὀρθὸν ἅπαντα]: Wescher. || 16–18: ἐπ[ὶ μὲν] τὰ εὐώνυμα ὡς ἐπὶ θάλασσαν εἶναι Δελφῶν| [ἱερὰν χώραν, τὰ δὲ δεξιὰ ἀπ' ἐ]κείνου τ[οῦ ὅ]ρου ὃς ἐπεδείχθη μοι κα[τὰ τὸν Ἀστράβαντα τῶν Ἀμφισσέων εἶναι]: Schmidt. ||

20–26: [- - ὅ]ρια ἀγωγὴν τὴν ἐ[ν -|- ἐξ]έταξαν οὕτως Ἀ[μφιccεῖc? -|- ἀπὸ θαλ]άccης κατὰ τὸ βραχ[ύ - or ύτατον -|-] τοὺc ὅρουc ἀπέχειν κ[αὶ -|- τ]ῆς ἁλέας, καθ' ὃ τελευ[τᾶι ὁ τῶν ἱερομνημόνων ἀφοριcμόc| -] τῶν ὅρων καὶ τῆς θα[λάccης -|-] ἀναμφιc[β]ήτ[ητον -]: *SIG*^{3}.

C: The border between Delphi and Antikyra

C. Avidio Nigrino leg. Aug. pro pr.

Decreta ex tabellis recitata VI idus Octobr. Eleusine. cum Optimus Princeps sententia[m]
hieromnemonum qua consecratam regione⟨m⟩ Apolloni Pythio ex auctoritate Mani Acili et s[enatus]
determinaverunt sequendam esse praescripsisset, quae etiam Delphis in latere aedis insculpta
est, neque veniret in dubium inter Anticyrenses quoque et Delphos quibus iudex datus [sum]
ab Optimo Principe ea sententia stari oportere, necessaria fuit diligentior exploratio tam ve-
tusta{t}e rei tanto magis quod et possessio quibusdam locis variaverat et vocabula regionum qu-
ae hieromnemonum determinatione continebantur vix iam nota propter temporis spatium
utraque pars ad utilitatem suam transferebat. cum itaque et in re praesenti saepius fuerim et
quid aut ex notitia hominum aut ex instrumentis quae exstabant colligi potera{n}t pluribus diebus [excus]-
serim, quae maxime visa sunt cum hieromnemonum iudicio congruere hac sententia comprehendi, [qua]
etiamsi utrorumque spei aliquid apscisum est, poterit tamen videri utrisque consultum quod [in]
posterum beneficio Optimi Principis certa possessio eis et sine lite continget. Opoentam in mari quod [ad]
Anticyram vergit, quam primam in determinatione hieromnemones nominaverunt,
eam esse constitit quae nunc ab aliis Opus ab aliis Opoenta dicitur promunt⟨o⟩rium quod
est a Cirra Anticyram navigantibus citra Nolo[chum haud procul] a Sa[l]musis. Ab eo recto ri-
gore ad monticul[os quos app]ellatos Acra Colop[hia esse in sen]tentia hieromne{mon}-
monum etiam ex eo apparet quod naturales in ut[roque] monticulo lapides ex[stant]
quorum in altero graeca inscriptio quae sign[ificat Delphi]cum terminum [hunc esse]
adhuc manet, cui vetustas fidem faciat, in altero [vero ea]mdem inscriptionem
[fuisse patet qua, quamvi]s sit erasa, fines o[b]ser[vari est mani]festum ad[s]cendent[ibus a mari]

[ita ut ab iis] dextra Anticyrensium, laeva sacra⟨e⟩ regionis Delphorum sint. ab iis [recto]
[rigore ad rupem illam quae D]olichonos vocatur et indubitatus inter Delphos [et]
[Anticyrenses limes est . . . c. 8 . . .]t perinde Delphorum region- - - - - - - -
- -

3: qua consecrata{m}⟨s⟩ regiones: *SIG*^{3}. || 6–7: ve|tustaie rei: Dodwell. ve|tusta{i}e rei: Mommsen, *SIG*^{3}. || 10–11: [conges]|serim: Mommsen. || 11–12: comprehend[i];| etiamsi etc.: *SIG*^{3}. || 15: pro[mu]nturium: Wescher, *SIG*^{3}. || 17: ad monticul{um}[os duo, quos app]ellatos: Wescher, *SIG*^{3}. || 21: [quae quamvi]s sit erasa fines o[b]ser[vari mani]festum: *SIG*^{3}. || 22: [ita ut] dextra Anticyrensium: *SIG*^{3}. || 25: te[rras?]: *SIG*^{3}.

D: The border between Delphi and Antikyra

[Ἐκ τῶν πινάκων μετειλημμέναι ˅ Πρ. ϛ′εἰδ. ˅ Ὀκτωβρ. Ἐν Ἐλευσῖνι. Ἐπεὶ προσετάχθη ὑπὸ τ]οῦ Ἀρίστου Αὐτοκράτορος τὴν τῶν ἱερο-
[μνημόνων κρίσιν, δί ἣν τὴν ἱερὰν χώραν τὴν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ Πυθίου ἔκ τε τῆς Μ]ανίου Ἀκειλίου γνώμης καὶ ἐκ δόγματος
[τῆς συνκλήτου ἀφώρισαν, πασῶν μάλιστα κυρίαν τηρεῖν, ἥπερ καὶ νῦν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τοῦ Ἀ]πόλλωνος τοῦ ἐν Δελφοῖς ἐνκεχαραγ-
[μένη ἐστίν, ἕνεκα] καὶ τούτου ἐν τ̣[ῇ Ἀντικυρέων καὶ Δε]λφῶν πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἀμ[φισβητή]σει, οἷς κριτὴς ἐδόθη⟨ν⟩ ὑπὸ τοῦ Μεγίστου
5 [Αὐτοκράτορος, ἐ]κ̣ατέρων ὁμολογ̣[ούντων, ἀναγκαῖο]ν ἐγένετο ἐπιμελεσ-
τέραν [οὕτω]ς̣ παλαιοῦ πράγματος ποιήσασθαι τὴν
[ἐξέτασιν, ὅσῳ μ]ᾶλλον ὅτι καὶ τὰ τ[εκμήρια τὰ περί τ]ινων μερῶν ἀμφιβολίαν εἶχε[ν καὶ αἱ] ὀνομασίαι τῶν τόπων αἱ ἐν τῷ τῶν ἱ-
[ερομνημόνων ἀφ]ορισμῷ διὰ τὸ τοῦ [χρόνου] μῆ[κος οὐ]κέτι ὁμοίως γεινωσκόμεναι [παρεῖ]χον ἀφορμὴν ἑκατέροις τοῦ μεταφέ-
[ρειν εἰς τὸ λυσι]τ̣ελοῦν αὐτοῖς. ἅτ[ε ο]ὖν καὶ ἐπ[ὶ τῆς] αὐτοψίας τῶν τόπων πλεονάκις [γενό]μενος καὶ ἢ ἐκ τῆς τῶν ἐνχωρίων γνώ-
[μης ἢ ἐκ τῶν προφερ]ομένων ἀποδεί[ξεω]ν πλείο[σιν] ἡμέραις ἐξετάσα⟨ς, ἅ⟩
10 μοι μάλιστα ἔ[δοξε]ν̣ τῇ τῶν ἱερομνημόνων συμφωνεῖν
[κρίσει τῇδε τῇ ἀποφά]σει περιέλαβον· δ̣[ι' ἣν ε]ἰ καί τι [δ]όξει τῆς ἑκατέρων ἐλπίδος ἀφηρῆ[σθαι, ἀλλ]ὰ ἐκε[ῖνό] γ̣ε ἀμφοτέροις περ[ιές]-
[ται, ὅτι ὁ Μέγιστος ἡμῶ]ν Αὐτοκ̣[ράτω]ρ̣ βε̣[βαί]αν αὐτοῖς εἰς τοὐπιὸν ὧν ἔχουσι τὴν κτῆς[ιν καὶ ἀναμφισβ]ήτητον παρέσχ[ε]
['Οπόεντα ἐν θαλάσσῃ ἥ πρὸς Ἀ]ν̣τίκ̣[υράν ἐστι]ν̣, ἣν [π]ρώτην ἐν τῷ περιορισμῷ τῆς ἱερᾶς χ[ώρας οἱ ἱερομνήμονες ὠ]ν̣όμασ[αν,]
[τὸ αὐτὸ εἶναι ἄκρον ὡμολογήθη, ὃ νῦν ὑπὸ μέν τι]νων 'Οπόεντα, ὑπὸ δέ τινων 'Οποῦς π[ροσονομάζεται καὶ τοῖς ἀπὸ Κίρρας]
[εἰς Ἀντίκυραν πλέουσιν ἐντός ἐστι Ναυλόχου, πρ]οκείμενον τῶν χωρίων ἃ καλεῖται Σα[λμοῦσσαι. ἐκ δὲ τούτου τοῦ ἄκρου]
15 [ἐπ' ὀρθὸν εἰς ὄρη δύο ἃ ἐν τῇ τῶν ἱερομνημόνων κρίσε]ι κεκλῆσθαι Ἄκρα Κολώφια καὶ ἐκ τούτω[ν γεινώσκεται, ὅτι πετρώδεις τι]-
[νὲς ἐν ἀμφοτέροις τοῖς ὄρεσι λίθοι εἰσὶν ὧν ἐν μὲν τῷ ἑτέρῳ] ἔτι καὶ νῦν ἐπιγραφὴ μένε[ι, διὰ τὴν ἀρχαιότητα πιστωτέα,]

[ἥ cημαίνει τοῦτον τὸν λίθον Δελφῶν ὅρον εἶναι, ἐν δὲ τῷ ἑτέρῳ α]ὐτὸ τοῦτο ἐπεγέγραπτ[ο, καίτοι νῦν ἐκκεκολαμμένον ἦν·]
[ὥcτε τῷ ἐπαναβάντι τὰ δεξιὰ τῶν Ἀντικυρέων, τὰ δὲ εὐώνυμα τῆς ἱε]ρᾶς [χ]ώρας τῶν Δ[ελφῶν εἶναι. - - - - - - - -]

1: [κρίcεις ἐκ διπτύχων μετειλλημέναι]: *SIG*^{3}. [ἐπεὶ ἐκελεύcθη]: *SIG*^{3}. || 8–10: καὶ ἡ ἐκ τῆς τῶν ἐγχωρίων γνώ|[μης περὶ τῶν προφερ]ομένων ἀπόδει[ξις ἐ]ν πλείο[cιν] ἡμέραις ἐξετάcαντί μοι μάλιcτα ἔ[δοξε] τῆι τῶν ἱερομνημόνων cυμφωνεῖν| [κρίcει, ἣν ταύτηι τῆι ἀποφά]c[ει] περιέλαβον: *SIG*^{3}. || 14: [- ἐcτιν ἐπὶ τῆιδε Ναυλόχου, οὐ πολὺ ἀπ]οκείμενον τῶν χωρίων κτλ: *SIG*^{3}.

III: The inscription of 125 B.C., cited in **163**

C7 . . . . [ἔκριναν περὶ τῶν ὅρων τῆς χώ]ρας ἱερᾶς, ὥcτε κρίμα κύριον εἶναι δ [o]ἱ ἱερομνή-
[μονες ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Ὀρνιχίδα ἐν Δελφοῖc πεποιήκαcιν οἱ ὁρίζοντες τὴν] ὁμοροῦcαν τῆι ἱερᾶι χώραι κατὰ πρόcωπον. ὅροι
[περιεγράφηcαν . . . 10 . . ., διὰ ταύτην τὴν αἰτίαν ὅτι ἰδιῶταί τινες κατ]έχουcι τοὺc ἐξ cυγκλήτου δόγματος
10 [τῶι θεῶι δεδομένους ἀγρούc, ἔcτι δ' ὅπου ἐπεργάζονται . . . 14 . . . κα]ί τινες δῆμ[οι ὁμ]οροῦcαν ἑκάcτου.

37 . . . . ἐντὸc το[ύτων ὁρίω]ν χώρα [ἐcτὶν ἥ]
καλεῖται Νάτεια γεωργουμένη, ἣν Μάνιοc Ἀκίλιοc τῶι θεῶι δέδωκε.

9: [οἱ αὐτοὶ περιεγράφηcαν τῆδε διὰ ταύτην τὴν αἰτίαν κτλ]: *SIG*^{3}. || 10: [ἐπεργάζονται τὴν ἱερὰν χώραν]: *SIG*^{3}.

This incident in a long series of arbitrations involving Delphi and its neighbours is documented by a combination of contemporary inscriptions and material from the later Roman period.[1] The contemporary evidence (I) consists of a letter from the Roman consul for 191 B.C., Manius Acilius Glabrio, to the Delphians and an inscription that enumerates land confiscations ordered by him. The later documents, which record arbitrations between Delphi and its neighbours from 125 B.C. (III) and A.D. 117 (II), refer to earlier settlements made by Acilius and the senate, and possibly to a contemporaneous hieromnemonic judgement. It seems that issues raised in 125 B.C. and A.D. 117 were similar to those raised at the time when Acilius was settling the affairs of Delphi. We can therefore supplement the contemporary evidence we have of Acilius's actions at Delphi, and tentatively make the following assumptions: (1) Delphi in 191/0 had a dispute, settled in its favour, with its Lokrian neighbours to the west and northwest, Amphissa and Myania, and (2) Delphi

1. See **1** and **22** for earlier incidents and **163** for the later dispute during the archonship of Eukleidas. The texts dealing with Delphi's territorial conflicts will be reedited by D. Rousset in a forthcoming supplement of *BCH*.

had a similar dispute at the same time with its eastern, Phokian neighbour, Antikyra.

In the letter that Acilius addressed to the Delphians (I A), he affirmed that the judgements he had made with respect to land confiscated from Delphi's neighbours and given to the city of Delphi and the sanctuary of Apollo were to stand. It is obvious that the decisions made by Acilius were disputed by those to whom they proved detrimental; and it seems quite clear from the enumeration of confiscations that the state that lost the most from the new apportionment of land was Amphissa, Delphi's western neighbour and constant rival for land.[2] Conversely, the territories of Delphi and of the Apollo sanctuary may have reached their greatest expanse yet.[3] Although it is not always possible to separate the sacred and secular affairs of Delphi, it appears that in this case we are dealing with both public land awarded to Delphi and sacred land dedicated to the sanctuary.

The later documents appear to refer to a series of more formal boundary arbitrations perhaps undertaken at this time. In the second century A.D., when Avidius Nigrinus was settling a number of boundary disputes between Delphi and its neighbours, he was ordered by the emperor Trajan to adhere, presumably as closely as possible, to a previous judgement that had been made by the Delphic hieromnemones in accordance with a principle laid down by Acilius and the senate. Although it is much disputed, it is not impossible that this "hieromnemonic judgement" refers to settlements made in or perhaps shortly after 190 by the Delphic Amphiktyony, settlements based on a general ruling made by Acilius and the senate.[4] The hieromnemonic judgement to which Nigrinus refers apparently regulated boundary disputes between Delphi and Amphissa and Myania to the west, and between Delphi and Antikyra to the east. A copy of this judgement was still extant at Delphi in the later Roman period, inscribed on the left wall (as one entered) of the temple of Apollo. Here too the issue seems to have been both public and sacred land. Presumably the judgements favoured Delphi, since to do so was clearly a part of Acilius's policy, and the judgements of the hieromnemones were made in accordance with Acilius's principles.

2. Although the Romans would have had their own political reasons for wishing to act to the detriment of Amphissa, it does seem that Amphissa had an infamous history of encroaching on the sacred land. It may be that in this case, however, the Amphissans could have argued justification: if the sentence of Pausanias the Thessalian (**22**), which had favoured the cause of Amphissa, predated the decision of Acilius, then the Amphissans could have been in control of some regions quite legitimately.

3. Daux, *Delphes*, p. 232; Lerat, p. 74.

4. In favour of the view that the reference to a *hieromnemonic* judgement is to the 125 B.C. judgement, rather than a judgement made in 190, see Daux, *Delphes*, pp. 664–70. See also Pomtow, Plassart, Roussel. In support of a hieromnemonic decision in 190, see Tod; G. Colin, *BCH* 27 (1903) p. 115.

It seems more natural to connect the hieromnemonic judgement referred to by Trajan's representative Nigrinus, specifically stated to have been based on the express desires of Acilius and the senate, with a judgement made c. 190 than with the judgement made in 125. In addition, there are certain details of the A.D. 117 arbitration that might lead us to believe that Nigrinus was not referring to the arbitration of 125 B.C. For example, Myania, Delphi's northwestern neighbour, was apparently not a disputant in 125 B.C. (its name does not appear in the 125 B.C. inscription); however, Myania was a party to the dispute in A.D. 117, and the quarrel with Myania at that time was settled by a reference to the hieromnemonic decision taken κατὰ τὴν Μανίου Ἀκειλίου γνώμην. Such a decision, taken with respect to Myania, should not be referred to 125, when Myania was apparently not involved. Another discrepancy involves the case of Antikyra. In 125 B.C., according to the extant contemporary inscription, Delphi and Antikyra were on the same side, jointly disputing territory with Amphissa. But in A.D. 117, when Nigrinus was judging the case, Delphi and Antikyra were in dispute with each other. At that time Nigrinus appears to have followed the hieromnemonic settlement in making his own decision in the arbitration between Delphi and Antikyra. Again, this would tend to argue that the hieromnemonic arbitration is not to be referred to 125, when Delphi and Antikyra were on the same side, but rather to the more plausible date of 190 B.C.

The affairs of Delphi clearly provided opportunities for third-party interventions and diplomacy on a frequent basis. Disputes over the sacred land, as well as Delphic public land, commonly went to arbitration (**1**, **22**, **117**, **126**, **163**). The affairs of the Amphiktyony were also the focus of arbitral activity from time to time, especially in the second century. In particular, disputes within ethnic groups over the hieromnemonic representation were submitted to a neutral party for settlement (**133**, **139**, **166**, **167**). These disputes arose at a time when the Amphiktyony's political importance was declining, and during a period when it was no longer monopolized by the sole power of the Aitolian League, as it had been in the third century. The Romans had settled Delphic affairs in the wake of the defeat of the Aitolians and reorganized the Amphiktyony. Throughout the course of the second century, however, the arrangements made clearly became unsatisfactory to many, and the Amphiktyony was plagued by disputes over its membership.[5]

5. A document that may be connected to the period of the Roman reorganization of the Delphic Amphiktyony refers to κριτήρια καὶ ψῆφοι τῶν Ἀμφικτιόνων (Sherk 39; Daux, *Delphes,* pp. 675–78). The document is a letter of a Roman magistrate and is perhaps to be dated to around 186 B.C. The references to judgements and Amphiktyonic votes may suggest that around the time the Romans were settling the boundaries of Delphi and the Delphic sanctuary, they were also participating in some discussions over hieromnemonic representation.

89. A sympolity between Hypnia and Myania calling for arbitration (c. 190?)

Two fragments of an inscription (A and B) found at Delphi. A: h (max.): 0.165 m; w (max.): 0.10 m; d (max.): 0.06 m. B: h (max.): 0.40 m; w (max.): 0.64 m; d: 0.24 m. The inscription is extremely difficult to read, and the underlined portions represent sections where Klaffenbach, on autopsy, admitted that he was unsure about the previous readings of the stone.

J. Bousquet, *BCH* 89 (1965) pp. 665–81; *SEG* XXIII.305 (after Bousquet); *Klaffenbach, *IG* IX^2 1.3.748; J. Pouilloux, *FDelphes* III.4, 4.352.

G. Daux, *BCH* 63 (1939) p. 167; Lerat, pp. 88–89; Robert, *REG* 1967, 307; S. Georgoudi, *REG* 87 (1974) pp. 173f.; J. Bousquet, *BCH* 101 (1977) p. 455; *SEG* XXVII.77.

A: Column 1

. . . . ΝΟΔ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
. . ΑΝΑΙΙΟΔ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
[τ]οῦ λόγου ΙΙ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
. . χος τοῖς ἐν τ̣ο̣- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
. . ρας, ὁ δὲ ἄρχω[ν - - - - - - - - - - - - - κ]-
[λαρ]ωσάτω δικασ[τήριον - - - - - - - - - - -]
. . . ἀνδρῶν πε[ντ- - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
. .λαχόντες - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
. . ΤΑΤΩΝ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
[. . ε]ἰ δέ τίς κ[α - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
. . . . . ΗΤ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

B: Column 2

- - - - - - - - - - - - -ΟΙ- - - - - - - - - -
[. . . . . 16 . . . . . κ]αθὼς τοῖς Ὑπνι-
[έοις . . . . 12 . . . .]ΙΛ . . . . αίου δόμε-
[ν . . . 13–14 . . .]Ι ἐν Ὑπνίαι τᾶς χώρ-
[ας τα]ύτας δικαστήριον δότω ἁ πόλις
. 3–4 . ων τῶν ἀπολ[ει]πόντων ἐξ Ὑπνίας
[κὰτ] τὸ μέρος, καθὼς καὶ τᾶν θυσιᾶν μ̣ε̣τ̣-
[έ]χοντι ˅ κὰτ ταὐτὰ δὲ καὶ τὰν ἄ̣ς̣π̣ορον ν-
[ε]μ̣όντων ˅ κὰτ ταὐτὰ δὲ καὶ τὰς πρεσβεί-
ας, εἴ τοίς κα ἀποστέλλωντι, ἀποστελλ-
όντων ˅ ἀρχὸν ἐξ Ὑπνίας κὰτ τὸ μέρος
ἐλέσσθ̣[ων] ˅ εἰ δὲ μὴ διοικέοι τὰ τῶν πολ-
ίων, ποθελέσσθων ἀρχὸν ἐξ Ὑπνίας κ-
ὰτ τὸ μέρος ˅ τοὶ δὲ ἄρχοντες τοὶ ἐν Ὑπ-
νίαι κατα[γραφό]ντων τοὺς στρατιώτα-
ς τοὺς ἐν Ὑπνίαι ˅ ἐπεί κα πορεύωνται,

πορευέσθων κὰτ τὸ μέρος, καθὼς καὶ τᾶν
θυσιᾷν μ̣ε̣[τέχ]οντι ˅ σίταρχον δὲ λα[μ]βα-
νόντων κὰτ τὸ μέρος ˅ τὸν δὲ ἰατρὸν καὶ τ-
οὺς ἄλλους δαμοσιεργοὺς ἐν Ὑπνίαι κατα-
στᾶ[σα]ι̣ τῶν αὐτῶν μισθῶν, καθὼς καὶ πρό-
τερον Ὑπνιεῖς καθίσταν ˅ καθισστάντων
ἀ[μ]φότεροι ˅ χωροφυλακεόντων δὲ τοὶ Μυ-
ανεῖς τὰν Μυα[νιάδα] ˅ τοὶ Ὑπνιεῖς τὰν Ὑπνι-
άδα ˅ τὰς σκοπιὰς καὶ τὰ ὅρια κοινᾶι ἀμφό-
[τ]εροι ˅ τὸν δὲ στατῆρα μὴ ἐμφερόντων το-
[ὶ ἐν] Ὑπνίαι χωροφυλακέοντες μηδὲ τοὶ ἐμ Μ-
[υανία]ι ˅ πρόβατα ˅ ἑκατ[ερ . . . . 11–12 . . . .]

B: Column 3

. . . . ν̣ τᾶι προτέραι τας . . . 13 . . .
ἑκατέρας ˅ εἰ δέ τις τῶν προβατέων τ[ῶν χ]-
ρησαμένων τὰ πρόβατα ποτάγοι πρὸ τᾶ[ς λ]-
ώτιος, λωτίξας ἀπαγέτω ˅ ὅσοι δέ κα τῶ[ν πρ]-
οβα ˅˅˅ τέων μὴ χρήσ[ω]νται τᾶι χώραι λω[τίζ]-
ο̣ν̣τ̣ε̣ς τὰς πόκας, νέμοντες ἐν τᾶι χώραι [α]-
ὐλιζόντω ἀμέρας δέκα ˅ εἰ δέ τί κα τῶν δι[ο]-
ρθωμάτων τῶν ὕστερον ποτιφερομένων
τᾶς Πανκλέος ἀρχᾶς ἀμφίλλογον γίνητ-
αι, ἐπικριθέντων ἐν Αἰσχρίωνι, Ἀρχεστ[ρά]-
τωι Φυσκέοις ˅ Κρατίνωι Τριτεῖ ˅ Κ . . . . .-
μωι, Δαμοκλεῖ, Ἀρισστομάχωι Χα[λειέοι]-
ς ˅ κρινόντων δὲ μὴ ἔλασσον τριῶ[ν ˅ τῶν]
δὲ λόγων τῶν κατὰ μῆνα τιθεμέν[ων ˅ ἐ]-
πεί κα λάβηι ὁ ἐγ Μυανίας βούλαρχο[ς παρ]-
ὰ τῶν ἐξ Ὑπνίας ἀρχείων τὰ ἀντίγ[ραφα κα]-
ὶ συνθῆι ἐν τὰ κιβώτια, ἐπιβαλλέτω τ[ὸν δα]-
κτύλιον ὁ ἐγ Μυανίας καὶ Ὑπνίας βούλ[αρχο]-
ς ˅ κὰτ ταὐτὰ δὲ καὶ τοὶ ἐξ Ὑπνίας βούλα[ρχοι]
ἐπεί κα λάβωντι τὰ ἀντίγραφα παρὰ τοῦ [ἐγ Μυ]-
ανίας βουλάρχου καὶ συνθέωντι ἐν τὸ κιβ[ώτιο]-
ν, συνεπιβαλλέτω τὸν δακτύλιον ὁ ἐγ [Μυ]-
ανίας καὶ ἐξ Ὑπνίας βούλαρχο[ς . . . 10 . . .]
Ν τοὶ ἐξ Ὑπνίας ἐμ Μυανίαν[. . . 9 . . . ˅ ὁ δὲ]
νόμος καὶ τὸ ψάφισμα τὸ τῶ[ν - - - - - - - - - -]
- -
- -
- - - - - - - - - - - - ΛΗΤ- - - - - - - - - - -

6: or δικαc[τάc]: Bousquet. || 24: Klaffenbach suggests ἄλλον might be read in place of ἀρχόν. || 34: Bousquet suggests τοὶ Ὑπνιεῖc might be read as well as ἀμφότεροι.

This inscription records a partial sympolity between the Lokrian communities of Hypnia and Myania. Apparently Myania was the dominant partner in this arrangement, but both states retained a certain degree of autonomy. This was not a complete synoikism: one new state was not created. Rather, the two communities seem to have been concerned to strengthen their own position by cooperating in certain community services and international obligations, as well as arranging for a peaceful use of joint territory.

There appears to be a reference to a tribunal, or to judges, chosen by lot, in the first section of the agreement (lines 5–6), but unfortunately the inscription is so fragmented that it is impossible to determine the context. The reappearance of the reference in the second column (line 16), together with the mention of land, might suggest a neutral arbitration over some territorial rights.[1] There is a definite reference in the third section of the inscription (lines 46–52) to the settlement of disputes by a neutral tribunal. Myania and Hypnia clearly added an arbitration clause to their sympolity agreement. The fact that not only are the arbitrating communities named but the individual judges are also specified might indicate that a rather limited view was taken of the issues over which Myania and Hypnia might go to arbitration: presumably matters relating to the sympolity.[2] Arbitration may have been used in forming the sympolity in the first place; if these men from Tritea, Chaleion, and Physkos had acted satisfactorily as neutral negotiators at that time, it would be natural to arrange to hold them in reserve for possible future need.

The sympolity should probably be dated to around 190 B.C. The political circumstances of the time, the vacuum created by the defeat of the Aitolians by Rome and the disappearance of their dominance over Delphi and the surrounding regions, must have created an atmosphere of uncertainty for the small communities of Lokris. If the hieromnemonic boundary arbitration discussed in **88** is in fact to be referred to the year 190, then we know that Myania suffered a loss with respect to its neighbour Delphi at this time.[3]

1. Bousquet, *BCH* 89, p. 672.

2. It is the name of one of these judges (Kratinos of Tritea) that allows the inscription to be dated to the first or second decade of the second century.

3. Not only Myania but also those Lokrian communities chosen to support the sympolity by sending judges apparently suffered in the new allocation of territories carried out by Acilius in 190. In the list of confiscations cited in **88**, three Triteans are mentioned (including the judge Kratinos), eight Chaleians, and thirteen citizens of Physkos.

90. Chios settles various disputes between Lampsakos and Parion (c. 190 or shortly after?)

A fragment of an inscription discovered on Chios. H: 0.40 m; w: 0.28 m; d (max.): 0.15 m.

*****J. Vanseveren, *RPh* 63 (1937) pp. 337–44; Frisch, *ILampsakos*, T 105; id., *Die Inschriften von Parion* (Bonn, 1983) pp. 68–69, T 59.

P. Herrmann, *MDAI(I)* 29 (1979) pp. 262f.

[- - - - - - - - - - - - - - δι]άλυσιν Λαμψακη[νῶν]
[καὶ Παριανῶν - - - - - ἡ]ξίωσε⟨ν⟩ [ὁ] δῆμος ἑκάτερο[ς]
[κρίνεσθαι τὰ ἀδικήματα κ]αὶ τὰ ἐγκλήματα καὶ τὰς δίκ[ας]
[τὰς πρότερον? γεγενημέ]νας ὅσαι ἦσαν ἔκκλητοι, τάς τε δ[ί]-
[κας λοιπὰς ἦρθαι πάς]ας καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἐγκλήματα ἢ ἀδική[μα]-
[τα ἢ ὀφειλήματα (or συμβόλαια) πά]ντα· ὁμοίως δὲ ἦρθαι καὶ εἴ τινά κατ .
[- - - - - - - - ὑπῆρ]χεν ἀδικήματα μηθενὸς ὑπολει[πομέ]-
[νου - - πρὸς αὐ]τὰς ἐγκλήματος τῶν ἐκ τοῦ πρότερο[ν]
[χρόνου, καὶ εἰ τοῖς ἰδι]ώταις ὑπάρχει πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς συμβόλ[αια]
[ἐνεστῶτα κατὰ τὸν πόλ]εμον, καὶ ἐπὶ τούτοις συγκαταθεμέ[νων]
[τῶν παραγενομένων] ἀπὸ τῶν πόλεων· ἀγαθῆι τύχηι· δε[δόχθαι]
[τῶι δήμωι· εὔξασθαι μὲ]ν τὸν πρύτανιν τὸν στεφανηφ[όρον καὶ]
[τοὺς ἱερεῖς τοὺς δημ]οτελεῖς καὶ τὰς ἱερείας θεοῖς π[ᾶσι]
[καὶ πάσαις γίνεσθαι συμ]φεροντ[ω]ς τὴν σύλλυσιν ἐπ' ἀγαθ[ῶι]
[τῶι δήμωι τῶι Λαμψακηνῶ]ν καὶ τῶι δήμωι τῶι Παριανῶ⟨ν⟩
[καὶ - - - - - - - - - - -] ἐπιτελέσαι θυσίαν θεοῖς πᾶσι
[καὶ πάσαις· - - - - - - τοὺ]ς πρεσβευτὰς καὶ τὸν ἐπήκοον [ἐ]-
[κατέρας τῆς πόλεως - - - - -] τας μετὰ Λαμψακηνῶν καὶ Παρι-
[ανῶν - - - - - - - - -]ν· πέμψαι δὲ καὶ πρεσβείαμ πρ[ὸς]
[τὸν δῆμον τὸν Λαμψακη]νῶν καὶ τὸν δῆμον τὸμ Παρια-
[νῶν τὴν διαλεξομένην περ]ὶ τῆς ἐπιτετελεσμένης ὑπὸ τ[οῦ]
[δήμου τοῦ ἡμετέρου πρὸς αὐτ]ὰς συλλύσεως· ἵνα δὲ καὶ δια⟨μ⟩[έ]-
[νηι ταῦτα κύρια εἰς τὸν ἅπαν]τα χρόνον, τοὺς ἐξεταστὰς [καὶ]
[τοὺς πολεμάρχους ἐπιμελεῖ](ϲ)θαι κατασκευῆς στή[λης]
[λιθίνης ἐφ' ἧς τόδε τὸ ψ]ήφισμα ἀν[αγραφήσεται - - - - -]

1–2: Vanseveren suggests [ἐπειδὴ ἡ]ξίωσεν or [καθότι, ἡ]ξίωσεν. || 5–6: ἀδική-[ματα ἢ ὀφειλήματα πά]ντα: Frisch, *ILampsakos*. ἀδική[μα|τα ἢ συμβόλαια πά]ντα: Frisch, *IParion*. || 6–7: καὶ εἴ τινα κατ' [ἰ|διώτου ὑπῆρ]χεν: Frisch, *ILampsakos*, *IParion* (already suggested as a possibility by Vanseveren). || 7–8: ὑπολει[πομέ|νου πρὸς αὐ]τὰς: Frisch, *ILampsakos*.

This decree of Chios provides us with the evidence for a case of arbitration by Chios between the town of Parion and its neighbour Lampsakos. As when Eretria arbitrated between Paros and Naxos (**83**), and perhaps also in the

arbitration agreement between Temnos and Klazomenai (**71**), it appears that Chios may well have dealt both with private cases and with cases involving an individual and a city, as well as with public disputes between the two states themselves.[1] The Parians and Lampsakenes agreed to submit various outstanding disputes to the arbitration of the Chians. The disputes specified appeared to have run the gamut: all types fall into the category of cases to be settled by the Chians.[2] Part of the problem, as with Temnos and Klazomenai, was that there had recently been hostilities between Parion and Lampsakos.[3]

The settlement of the various matters was carried out at Chios, and no mention is made of a journey to either of the disputing cities. In fact, it appears that the first embassy sent by the Chians to the parties to the dispute was the one sent to tell them of the Chians' final decision. The two states had obviously sent delegates (ἐπήκοοι) of their own to argue their cases in Chios. This indicates that no border disputes were involved here; or at least no boundary disputes that would have necessitated the kind of complex on-the-spot investigation by the judges that we find so frequently. No mention is made of a specific arbitral court at Chios, and the settlement is simply said to have been made by "the people," though this may be an indication that the tribunal (or tribunals) was drawn from all the people.[4]

91. A Prienian citizen acts as an advocate for Phokaia (?) (c. 190)

One of two inscriptions engraved on a column drum found at Priene. H: 0.71 m; diam.: 0.55 m.

*Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene* 65.

L. Robert, *RA* 24 (1926) pp. 180–81; *SEG* IV.482; Magie, *RRAM*, vol. 2, p. 965; Robert, *REG* 1969, 130.

[Ὁ] δῆμος ὁ Φω[καιέων]
[Ἀπολλό]δωρον Ποσει[δωνίου.]
ἔδοξεν τῆι βουλῆι καὶ [τῶι] δήμωι, [γνώ]μη
στρατηγῶν· ἐπ[ειδὴ] Ἀπολλό[δωρος Π]ο-

1. The terminology employed by the documents in these cases is quite similar.

2. Lines 2–6. Frisch interprets the ἔκκλητοι δίκαι as cases under appeal, as does Vanseveren.

3. A war between Parion and Lampsakos would fit the circumstances of Lampsakos's hostility towards Antiochos III in the 190s B.C., while Parion was under Antiochos's control. See P. Frisch, *ILampsakos*, pp. 131–32; id., *IParion*, pp. 68–69.

4. Lines 19–22 (based on the restoration of Vanseveren).

arbitration agreement between Temnos and Klazomenai (**71**), it appears that Chios may well have dealt both with private cases and with cases involving an individual and a city, as well as with public disputes between the two states themselves.[1] The Parians and Lampsakenes agreed to submit various outstanding disputes to the arbitration of the Chians. The disputes specified appeared to have run the gamut: all types fall into the category of cases to be settled by the Chians.[2] Part of the problem, as with Temnos and Klazomenai, was that there had recently been hostilities between Parion and Lampsakos.[3]

The settlement of the various matters was carried out at Chios, and no mention is made of a journey to either of the disputing cities. In fact, it appears that the first embassy sent by the Chians to the parties to the dispute was the one sent to tell them of the Chians' final decision. The two states had obviously sent delegates (ἐπήκοοι) of their own to argue their cases in Chios. This indicates that no border disputes were involved here; or at least no boundary disputes that would have necessitated the kind of complex on-the-spot investigation by the judges that we find so frequently. No mention is made of a specific arbitral court at Chios, and the settlement is simply said to have been made by "the people," though this may be an indication that the tribunal (or tribunals) was drawn from all the people.[4]

91. A Prienian citizen acts as an advocate for Phokaia (?) (c. 190)

One of two inscriptions engraved on a column drum found at Priene. H: 0.71 m; diam.: 0.55 m.

*Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene* 65.

L. Robert, *RA* 24 (1926) pp. 180–81; *SEG* IV.482; Magie, *RRAM*, vol. 2, p. 965; Robert, *REG* 1969, 130.

[Ὁ] δῆμος ὁ Φω[καιέων]
[Ἀπολλό]δωρον Ποσει[δωνίου.]
ἔδοξεν τῆι βουλῆι καὶ [τῶι] δήμωι, [γνώ]μη
στρατηγῶν· ἐπ[ειδὴ] Ἀπολλό[δωρος Π]ο-

1. The terminology employed by the documents in these cases is quite similar.

2. Lines 2–6. Frisch interprets the ἔκκλητοι δίκαι as cases under appeal, as does Vanseveren.

3. A war between Parion and Lampsakos would fit the circumstances of Lampsakos's hostility towards Antiochos III in the 190s B.C., while Parion was under Antiochos's control. See P. Frisch, *ILampsakos*, pp. 131–32; id., *IParion*, pp. 68–69.

4. Lines 19–22 (based on the restoration of Vanseveren).

5 ceιδωνίου Πριη[νεὺc] εὔνου[ν ἑαυτὸν] καὶ
[ἐ]κτενῆ παρεχόμεν[oc διετέλει κοινῆι τ]ε
τῶι δήμωι καὶ ἰδίαι τοῖc ἐ[ντυγχάν]ουcιν
αὐτῶι τῶν ἡμετέρων πολιτῶ[ν, καὶ] πα-
ραγενομένων εἰc Πριήνην τῶν [ἐκ Θε]c-
10 caλίαc πρεcβευτῶν πρόθυμο[ν ἑαυτὸν]
ἐμ πᾶcι καὶ λέγων καὶ πράcc[ω]ν [παρείχετο]
εἰc τὰ τῶι δήμωι cυμφέροντα· [χειροτονη]-
θείc τε ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Πρ[ιηνέων πρεc]-
βευτὴc εἰc Ζμύρναν ὑπὲ[ρ τῶν ἐνcτάντων?]
15 ἡμῖν πρὸc Ζμυρναίουc ἐπελ[θὼν - - - - -]
[ἐ]κτενῶc καὶ προθύμωc [κ]αὶ ΛΙΑ . . . . Η . . . .
[το]ὺc καθή[κ]οντας λόγουc διε[ξαγαγὼν ἀξίωc ἑαυτοῦ]
[τε κα]ὶ τῆc ἀποcτειλάcηc πα[τρί]δ[oc, τὴν πᾶ]-
[caν πρ]όνοιαν ἐποιεῖ[τ]ο [ἐμ π]ᾶcιν . . . . . .
20 . . . . 12 . . . . φερόμεθα - - - - - - - - - - -

9: Hiller von Gaertringen suggested [Μα]ccαλίαc as an alternative, though less likely, restoration. Robert considered it to be a better restoration than [Θε]ccαλίαc. Cf. P. Frisch, *ILampsakos,* p. 22 n. 5. || 17: [το]ὺc καθή[κ]οντας λόγουc διέ[θετο]: Robert.

This inscription, found at Priene, is a decree of Phokaia honouring a citizen of Priene. This individual, Apollodoros the son of Poseidonios, was evidently a man of some importance. In addition to acting as a representative of Priene in the matters mentioned in this inscription, he was also one of the advocates of Priene in the arbitration carried out by Rhodes between that state and Samos (**74**). Perhaps it was the success of the Prienian advocates at that time that advanced Apollodoros's career. Certainly he had the respect of his fellow citizens: we learn from the present inscription that he was elected to his position as Priene's ambassador. Unfortunately, the inscription tells us nothing of the nature of the dispute between Phokaia and Smyrna. The exceedingly friendly tone evinced by the Phokaians towards Apollodoros, who apparently was instrumental in working out a settlement, suggests that the final decision in the arbitration favoured Phokaia; but there is no way of knowing for sure.

Hiller von Gaertringen dated this inscription to about 190 B.C. He suggested that Priene offered its services as an arbitrator between Phokaia and Smyrna because Priene itself was indebted to Smyrna for its arbitration of the dispute between Priene and Miletos (**100**). But there is nothing in the inscription that demands that Apollodoros's services were those of a mediator or arbitrator; he could just as easily have been a Phokaian advocate, and the grateful tone of the honorary decree suggests that this is a plausible reconstruction of his role.[1]

1. The Prienian Apollodoros's Athenian namesake performed a similar service when he acted as a Delphian advocate in Delphi's dispute with Amphissa (**117**).

92. The constitution of the Lesbian League (between c. 190? and 167)

Three fragments found severally at Delos, believed to be part of the same document. Only the relevant portion of B (a heavily mutilated marble slab; h [max.]: 0.50 m; w: 0.21 m; d: 0.229 m) has been cited here.

F. Dürrbach/A. Jardé, *BCH* 29 (1905) pp. 209f., no. 68; *Roussel, *IG* XI.1064; Hiller von Gaertringen, *IG* XII supp. 136.

F. Bechtel, *Bezzenberger's Beiträge* 6, pp. 115f.; A. Wilhelm, *BCH* 29 (1905) p. 577; Raeder 48; Tod 58; C. D. Buck, *CPh* 8 (1913) p. 155; Robert, *REG* 1925, pp. 29–43; Steinwenter, p. 180; Robert, *REG* 1927, 219; S. Accame, *RFC* 74 (1947) pp. 104–21; J. Boüüaert, *La nouvelle Clio* 6 (1954) p. 362; Robert, *REG* 1955, 6; *SEG* XVI.449; O. Masson, *BN* 16 (1965) pp. 172–74; *SEG* XXIII.491; Gauthier, p. 344.

B [- - - - - - - cύ]νθηκα· δίδοντον δὲ τοὶς νόμοις - - - - - - -
[- - - - - - ἐν πέ]ντε ἀμέραις πρόσθε τᾶς ἐκλης[ίας - - -]
- - - - - - - - - -θέντων πάντων τῶν πρότε[ρον - - - - -]
- - - - - - - - - -ασθαι ταὶς πόλεις καὶ μάλιστα - - - - - -
[- - - - - - ὁμογν]ωμονέωσι περὶ τῶ κριτηρίω ε- - - - - - -
[- - - - - - - τᾶν] ἀπογραφείσαν πο[λί]ων ἀποκλᾳῷ[ς - -]
[- - - - - - τᾶν] λαχοίσαν πολίων τεσσάρων - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - -τα· [εἰς]αγώγεας δὲ πένπεσθαι - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -τοις καὶ εἰσαγώγεα[ς] ἐπε- - - -
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -οι ἐν τῶ ἴρω τῶ ἐμ Μές[σω - -]
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -νωσιν γράψαντες ε- - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - τὰ διαλυθέντα ἢ κριθέν[τα - -]
[- - - - - - - - - - - τὰ κριθ]έντα κύρια· αἳ δέ κέ τινε[ς -]
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - αὐταὶς δικάσασθα[ι - - -]
[- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - ἀ]ποστέλλωσι τοῖς - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - πρὸ τᾶς συνθή[κας - - - -]
[- - - - - - - - - - - - - - πε]ριεχομένων - - - - - - -

37: προσθέτας ἐκλης[ίας]: Dürrbach/Jardé. || 40: -ωμον ἔωσι: Dürrbach/Jardé. || 43: τα . . ἀγώγεας: Dürrbach/Jardé. || 45: τῶ ἴρω τῶ ἐμμες-: Dürrbach/Jardé.

This document is a treaty regulating relations between the Lesbian cities of Mytilene, Methymna, Antissa, and Eresos, perhaps the original contract of the League of Lesbos.[1] Among other matters covered by this treaty, such as military contributions and financial and legal regulations, was the settlement of potential disputes between the cities.[2] Because the inscription is so mutilated, it

1. The foundation of the Lesbian League probably occurred after the end of the Second Macedonian War, or after the defeat of Antiochos III by the Romans. Cf. Accame, p. 104; Sherk, p. 241.

2. B, lines 40f. Cf. **13**, **33**, **47**, **48**, **67**, **109**.

is impossible to tell from it what exactly the provisions were. However, mention is made of a κριτήριον (B, line 40), which probably refers to a tribunal, and of εἰcαγώγειc (B, line 44), a term that at Athens and elsewhere referred to magistrates responsible for bringing cases into court.[3] Lines 41–42 may refer to a register of particular cities, from which, when the need arose, certain ones were to be picked by lot to send judges. A similar system of choice by lot from a preselected list is to be found in the later arbitration treaty between Ephesos and Sardis (**170**). A federal sanctuary may have been established at the precinct of Messa in the centre of Lesbos; the foreign tribunal would sit there.[4] The decision of the tribunal, whether by compromise or by judgement, was to be final.[5]

The constitution of the federation of Lesbian states clearly called for the members of the League to submit their differences to arbitration. This requirement was enshrined in the founding document of the alliance, which provides the kind of evidence unavailable for such associations as the Achaian League. The nature of the disputes that went to arbitration and the provenance of potential arbitrators are illuminated by another inscription, discovered at Miletos.[6] Raeder had thought that arbitration between the states, public or private, would necessarily be carried out by other members of the Lesbian *koinon*. But his contention is refuted by the evidence of the Milesian inscription, which records a set of three decrees, two from Methymna and one from Eresos. These decrees tell us that judges came from Miletos, and also from Samos and Aigai, to settle disputes between the Methymnaians and Eresians, in accordance with the cυνθήκα. It seems likely, given the large number of unspecified disputes mentioned in the Milesian inscription, that they refer to private suits between individual citizens of the two communities.[7] As such, the Milesian inscription probably does not in itself represent a true case of public international arbitration. Nevertheless, it is clearly associated with the general Lesbian treaty and offers evidence of a kind not always available for the successful application of obligatory arbitration agreements. Furthermore, it seems likely that in the case of a public dispute arising between any of the states of Lesbos, a similar appeal to external arbitration would be made.

3. Roussel read [εἰc]αγώγεαc at line 43 as well, whereas the original editors reserved it for the following line, since they believed that there was not sufficient room to restore it here. See Robert, *REG* 1925, p. 39. On the εἰcαγώγειc, cf. **71**. If there were also officials called ἀγώγειc, then it is possible they played the same role as δικαcταγωγοί.

4. Line 45: ἐν τῶ ἰρω τῶ ἐμ Μέc[cω]. See Wilhelm; Roussel; Wilamowitz, *GGA* 2 (1914) pp. 104–5; Robert, *REG* 1925, p. 37; Accame, p. 104.

5. B, line 47: τὰ διαλυθέντα ἢ κριθέν[τα]; line 48: [τὰ κριθ]έντα κύρια.

6. See **9** Appendix.

7. *Pace* Rehm, who conjectured a boundary dispute between Eresos and Methymna. Robert (*REG* 1925, pp. 33–34) denied the possibility of a boundary dispute on the grounds that judges from more than one city were unusual in public international arbitrations, but cf. **63**, **85**, **109**. See Steinwenter, p. 154; Gauthier, p. 344.

93. Herakleia Pontica suggests mediation to Antiochos III and Rome (190)

Memnon, *FGH* 434 F18. 6–10 (Photios 229a–b).

Magie, *Buckler Studies,* p. 178; id., *RRAM*, vol. 1, p. 310; vol. 2, p. 967 n. 89; Badian, *FC*, p. 295; M. Janke, *Historische Untersuchungen zu Memnon von Herakleia* (Würzburg, 1963) pp. 23–30; P. Desideri, *SCO* 19–20 (1970–71) pp. 487–537; Will, vol. 2, pp. 213–15; Gruen, pp. 735–37; Scafuro, *Historia* 36 (1987) p. 35; Eckstein, *Historia* 37 (1988) p. 422.

Τὰ μὲν οὖν περὶ τῆς Ῥωμαικῆς ἀρχῆς μέχρι τοῦδε δίειειν ὁ συγγραφεύς. ἀναλαβὼν δὲ γράφει, ὅπως Ἡρακλεῶται διαπρεσβευσάμενοι πρὸς τοὺς τῶν Ῥωμαίων στρατηγοὺς ἐπὶ τὴν Ἀσίαν διαβεβηκότας, ἀσμένως τε ἀπεδέχθησαν καὶ ἐπιστολῆς φιλοφρονούμενοι ἔτυχον, Ποπλίου Αἰμιλίου ταύτην ἀποστείλαντος, ἐν ᾗ φιλίαν τε πρὸς αὐτοὺς τῆς συγκλήτου βουλῆς ὑπισχνεῖτο, καὶ τὰ ἄλλα προνοίας τε καὶ ἐπιμελείας, ἐπειδάν τινος αὐτῶν δέοιντο μηδεμιᾶς ὑστερεῖσθαι. (7) ὕστερον δὲ καὶ πρὸς Κορνήλιον Σκιπίωνα τὸν τὴν Λιβύην Ῥωμαίοις κτησάμενον, διαπέμπουσι πρεσβείαν, τὴν ὡμολογημένην φιλίαν ἐπικυροῦντες. (8) μετὰ ταῦτα δὲ πάλιν πρὸς τὸν αὐτὸν διαπρεσβεύονται, διαλλάττειν πρὸς Ῥωμαίους ἀξιοῦντες τὸν βασιλέα Ἀντίοχον, καὶ ψήφισμα πρὸς αὐτὸν ἔγραψαν, παραινοῦντες αὐτὸν τὴν πρὸς Ῥωμαίους διαλύσασθαι ἔχθραν. ὁ δὲ Κορνήλιος Σκιπίων ἀντεπιστέλλων τοῖς Ἡρακλεώταις, ἐπιγράφει οὕτω· "Σκιπίων στρατηγός, ἀνθύπατος Ῥωμαίων, Ἡρακλεωτῶν τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ χαίρειν"· ἐν ταύτῃ τήν τε πρὸς αὐτοὺς εὔνοιαν ἐπιβεβαιῶν, καὶ ὡς διαλύσαιντο Ῥωμαῖοι τὴν πρὸς Ἀντίοχον μάχην. τὰ αὐτὰ δὲ Λευκίῳ Πόπλιος Κορνήλιος Σκιπίων ὁ ἀδελφὸς καὶ στρατηγὸς τοῦ ναυτικοῦ τοῖς Ἡρακλεώταις διαπρεσβευσαμένοις ἀντέγραψε. (9) μετ' οὐ πολὺ δὲ πάλιν εἰς μάχην Ἀντίοχος Ῥωμαίοις κατέστη, καὶ ἀνὰ κράτος ἡττηθεὶς ἐπὶ συνθήκαις διελύσατο τὴν ἔχθραν, αἳ καὶ τῆς Ἀσίας αὐτὸν ἁπάσης ἀπεῖργον, καὶ τοὺς ἐλέφαντας καὶ τῶν νηῶν συναφῃροῦντο τὸν στόλον, τῆς Κομμαγηνῆς αὐτῷ καὶ τῆς Ἰουδαίας εἰς ἀρχὴν ὑπολειπομένων. (10) ἡ δὲ τῶν Ἡρακλεωτῶν πόλις πρὸς τοὺς ἐκπεμπομένους παρὰ τῶν Ῥωμαίων τῶν στρατηγῶν διαδόχους τὰ αὐτά τε διεπρεσβεύετο, καὶ ταῖς ὁμοίαις ἀντεδεξιοῦντο εὐνοίαις καὶ φιλοφρονήσεσι. καὶ τέλος συνθῆκαι προῆλθον Ῥωμαίοις τε καὶ Ἡρακλεώταις, μὴ φίλους εἶναι μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ συμμάχους ἀλλήλοις, καθ' ὧν τε καὶ ὑπὲρ ὧν δεηθεῖεν ἑκάτεροι. καὶ χαλκοῖ πίνακες δύο τὰς ὁμολογίας ἴσους καὶ ὁμοίας ἔφερον, ὧν ὁ μὲν παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις ἐν τῷ κατὰ τὸ Καπιτώλιον ἱερῷ τοῦ Διὸς καθηλώθη, ὁ δὲ κατὰ τὴν Ἡράκλειαν καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν τῷ τοῦ Διὸς ἱερῷ.

The historian Memnon, writing probably in the second century A.D., devoted a section of his work to the relations between Rome and the state of Herakleia Pontica in the early second century B.C. Embedded in his sketch of the first contacts between Rome and Herakleia (as summarized in Photios) is a notice that Herakleia cemented its friendship with Rome during the Antiochene War by offering to mediate between Rome and Antiochos, or at least by urging the two

to come to terms. According to Memnon, who was probably relying on a local history of Herakleia Pontica for this section of his own history,[1] the Herakleians first approached the Romans via an embassy sent to the Roman commanders when they crossed into Asia Minor in pursuance of the war against Antiochos. Their embassy was welcomed warmly by the Romans, and the Herakleians received a letter from a "Publius Aemilius," in which they were promised all present and future goodwill and friendship from Rome. This *amicitia* was later reasserted through an embassy to Scipio Africanus. Herakleian relations with Rome and the Scipios in particular were then confirmed when Herakleia dispatched yet another embassy to the Roman commanders, Lucius and his brother Africanus, in an attempt to persuade the Romans to settle their conflict with Antiochos diplomatically. A similar embassy was also sent to Antiochos himself. Again the Scipios are said to have responded graciously, and in fact the Herakleians were informed that the Romans had interrupted their hostile operations against the king. Nevertheless, the war between Antiochos and Rome was of course not settled by negotiation, and after the battle of Magnesia, Rome was able to impose its terms on Antiochos. At this time Herakleia sent another embassy to Rome to reaffirm its own relations with the victor. In the end, the Greek state achieved a treaty relationship with the Romans, *societas* as well as *amicitia*. The treaty was then inscribed on bronze plaques and displayed in both Rome and Herakleia.

That the story as told by Memnon cannot be wholly accurate seems self-evident. The identity of Publius Aemilius remains a mystery.[2] The warmth of Roman feeling for this relatively unimportant state is undoubtedly exaggerated, and attributable to the provenance of this history.[3] Furthermore, as Gruen points out in his discussion of the historicity of the treaty, the chronological arrangement of Photios's fragments of Memnon is suspect, a fact that leads to further confusion in the assessment of this account.[4]

But total rejection of the treaty, the mediation attempt, or both seems unwarranted. Given the fragmented or biased nature of many of our sources for the period, it does not seem legitimate to reject items solely because they do not appear in other writers, especially when it comes to the affairs of minor players. The scarcity of letters of Scipio or letters to Herakleia mentioned in other sources

1. See Jacoby's commentary in *FGH*, pp. 269f.

2. No Publius Aemilius is otherwise known. Gruen suggests it might have been an error for L. Aemilius Regillus (praetor 190; Broughton, vol. 1, p. 356) or perhaps L. Aemilius Scaurus (Livy 37.31.6).

3. See Scafuro, p. 35, who argues that the presentation of Herakleia as an arbitrator in Rome's affairs was a propagandistic fabrication, intended to make Herakleia look good. The fact that we find Memnon presenting Herakleia in this light elsewhere (**34**) might provide some support for Scafuro's view.

4. Gruen, p. 736.

or discovered in epigraphic form is surely not a viable reason to assume that Scipio and others did *not* write them, or that Herakleia never received them. So Memnon's account should not be rejected out of hand in its entirety, even if general considerations of logic argue against accepting it uncritically. It is not impossible that a city-state, especially one suffering from other pressures, might suggest mediation to end a major conflict, if such mediation would serve its own purposes.[5] It is also not impossible that a Roman commander might find that such a mediation attempt could work to his own advantage, and would use it at least as a stalling mechanism. It has been suggested that Scipio Africanus might have welcomed the possibility of negotiations, or at least of a delay, in order to facilitate the return of his son, the prisoner of Antiochos.[6] What is harder to accept is that Rome could have been turned aside from a determined course solely by the Herakleian request, or that successive Roman commanders treated the various Herakleian embassies with the extreme degree of warmth and enthusiasm that Memnon would have had his readers believe.

94. Athens and Rhodes intercede with Rome on behalf of Aitolia (190–189)

I: Livy 37.6.4–5.
II: Livy 37.7.3–4.
III: Livy 38.3.6–7.
IV: Livy 38.9.3–4.
V: Livy 38.10.1–4.
VI: Polybios 21.4.1–2 and 6–8.
VII: Polybios 21.25.9–11.
VIII: Polybios 21.29.1–2 and 9.
IX: Polybios 21.30.6–7.
X: Polybios 21.30.15–21.31.5.
XI: Polybios 21.31.16.

Ferguson, *Athens*, pp. 285–87; Larsen, *GFS*, pp. 427–28; D. Golan, *RivSA* 7 (1977) pp. 315–27; Berthold, p. 162; Gruen, p. 118; Eckstein, *Historia* 37 (1988) pp. 421–22; Ager, *Historia* 40 (1991) pp. 26–27.

5. Herakleia itself was troubled by hostilities with Prousias of Bithynia and the Galatians; Desideri argues that the Bithynian and Galatian threats were Herakleia's first concerns (pp. 494f.). As was true in the case of Rhodes and all other commercial states, Herakleian interests in general were best served by peace rather than war (Janke, p. 27; Desideri, p. 511).

6. See Desideri, pp. 511f.; cf. Will, vol. 2, p. 213.

or discovered in epigraphic form is surely not a viable reason to assume that Scipio and others did *not* write them, or that Herakleia never received them. So Memnon's account should not be rejected out of hand in its entirety, even if general considerations of logic argue against accepting it uncritically. It is not impossible that a city-state, especially one suffering from other pressures, might suggest mediation to end a major conflict, if such mediation would serve its own purposes.[5] It is also not impossible that a Roman commander might find that such a mediation attempt could work to his own advantage, and would use it at least as a stalling mechanism. It has been suggested that Scipio Africanus might have welcomed the possibility of negotiations, or at least of a delay, in order to facilitate the return of his son, the prisoner of Antiochos.[6] What is harder to accept is that Rome could have been turned aside from a determined course solely by the Herakleian request, or that successive Roman commanders treated the various Herakleian embassies with the extreme degree of warmth and enthusiasm that Memnon would have had his readers believe.

94. Athens and Rhodes intercede with Rome on behalf of Aitolia (190–189)

I: Livy 37.6.4–5.
II: Livy 37.7.3–4.
III: Livy 38.3.6–7.
IV: Livy 38.9.3–4.
V: Livy 38.10.1–4.
VI: Polybios 21.4.1–2 and 6–8.
VII: Polybios 21.25.9–11.
VIII: Polybios 21.29.1–2 and 9.
IX: Polybios 21.30.6–7.
X: Polybios 21.30.15–21.31.5.
XI: Polybios 21.31.16.

Ferguson, *Athens*, pp. 285–87; Larsen, *GFS*, pp. 427–28; D. Golan, *RivSA* 7 (1977) pp. 315–27; Berthold, p. 162; Gruen, p. 118; Eckstein, *Historia* 37 (1988) pp. 421–22; Ager, *Historia* 40 (1991) pp. 26–27.

5. Herakleia itself was troubled by hostilities with Prousias of Bithynia and the Galatians; Desideri argues that the Bithynian and Galatian threats were Herakleia's first concerns (pp. 494f.). As was true in the case of Rhodes and all other commercial states, Herakleian interests in general were best served by peace rather than war (Janke, p. 27; Desideri, p. 511).

6. See Desideri, pp. 511f.; cf. Will, vol. 2, p. 213.

I: Livy 37.6.4–5

Eo legati Athenienses primum ad P. Scipionem praegressum agmen, sicut ante dictum est, deinde ad consulem venerunt, deprecantes pro Aetolis. (5) clementius responsum ab Africano tulerunt, qui causam relinquendi honeste Aetolici belli quaerens Asiam et regem Antiochum spectabat, iusseratque Athenienses non Romanis solum, ut pacem bello praeferrent, sed etiam Aetolis persuadere.

II: Livy 37.7.3–4

Nihil impetratum ut mutaret consul; et ea quoque irrita legatio dimissa est. (4) secuti et Athenienses sunt; et princeps legationis eorum Echedemus fatigatos tot repulsis Aetolos et complorantes inutili lamentatione fortunam gentis ad spem revocavit, auctor indutias sex mensium petendi, ut legatos mittere Romam possent.

III: Livy 38.3.6–7

Quibus circumiectis gentibus iam undique se a Macedonibus tutos credentibus esse Aetolis fama adfertur Antiochum in Asia victum ab Romanis; nec ita multo post legati ab Roma rediere sine spe pacis Fulviumque consulem nuntiantes cum exercitu iam traiecisse. (7) his territi, prius ab Rhodo et Athenis legationibus excitis, ut per auctoritatem earum civitatium suae preces nuper repudiatae faciliorem aditum ad senatum haberent, principes gentis ad temptandam spem ultimam Romam miserunt, nihil, ne bellum haberent, priusquam paene in conspectu hostis erat, praemeditati.

IV: Livy 38.9.3–4

Haec mora iniecta est paci, cum iam Atheniensium Rhodiorumque legati, qui ad deprecandum pro iis venerant, apud consulem essent. (4) Amynander quoque Athamanum rex fide accepta venerat in castra Romana, magis pro Ambracia urbe, ubi maiorem partem temporis exulaverat, quam pro Aetolis sollicitus.

V: Livy 38.10.1–4

Eo tandem legati Aetoli, mirante consule quod morarentur, venerunt. (2) inde, postquam approbasse pacem concilium Aetolorum accepit, iussis proficisci Romam ad senatum permissoque ut et Rhodii et Athenienses deprecatores irent dato, qui simul cum iis proficisceretur, C. Valerio fratre ipse in Cephallaniam traiecit. (3) praeoccupatas aures animosque principum Romae criminibus Philippi invenerunt. ... (4) Rhodii tamen et Athenienses cum silentio auditi sunt. Atheniensis legatus Leon Hicesiae filius eloquentia etiam dicitur movisse.

VI: Polybios 21.4.1–2 and 6–8

Ὅτι πολιορκουμένων τῶν Ἀμφισσέων ὑπὸ Μανίου τοῦ Ῥωμαίων στρατηγοῦ, κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον ὁ τῶν Ἀθηναίων δῆμος, πυνθανόμενος τήν τε τῶν Ἀμφισσέων ταλαιπωρίαν καὶ τὴν τοῦ Ποπλίου παρουσίαν, ἐξαπέστειλε

πρεσβευτὰς τοὺς περὶ τὸν Ἐχέδημον, (2) ἐντειλάμενος ἅμα μὲν ἀσπάσασθαι τοὺς περὶ τὸν Λεύκιον καὶ Πόπλιον, ἅμα δὲ καταπειράζειν τῆς πρὸς Αἰτωλοὺς διαλύσεως.... (6) διόπερ ἅμα τῷ μνησθῆναι τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ὑπὲρ τῆς διαλύσεως, ἑτοίμως προσδεξάμενος τοὺς λόγους ἐκέλευσε παραπλησίως πειράζειν αὐτοὺς καὶ τῶν Αἰτωλῶν. (7) οἱ δὲ περὶ τὸν Ἐχέδημον, προδιαπεμψάμενοι καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα πορευθέντες εἰς τὴν Ὑπάταν αὐτοί, διελέγοντο περὶ τῆς διαλύσεως τοῖς ἄρχουσι τῶν Αἰτωλῶν. (8) ἑτοίμως δὲ κἀκείνων συνυπακουόντων κατεστάθησαν οἱ συμμίξοντες τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις.

VII: Polybios 21.25.9–11

Ὡς δὲ παραγενηθεὶς ἐκ τῆς Ῥώμης ὁ Δαμοτέλης τόν τε πόλεμον ἀνήγγειλε διότι μένει κατάμονος, καὶ τὴν τοῦ Μάρκου καὶ τῶν δυνάμεων διάβασιν ἐπ' αὐτούς, τότε δὴ παντελῶς εἰς ἀμηχανίαν ἐνέπιπτον καὶ διηπόρουν πῶς δεῖ χρήσασθαι τοῖς ἐπιφερομένοις πράγμασιν. (10) ἔδοξεν οὖν αὐτοῖς πρός τε Ῥοδίους πέμπειν καὶ πρὸς Ἀθηναίους, ἀξιοῦντας καὶ παρακαλοῦντας πρεσβεῦσαι περὶ αὐτῶν εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην καὶ παραιτησαμένους τὴν ὀργὴν τῶν Ῥωμαίων ποιήσασθαί τινα λύσιν τῶν περιεστώτων κακῶν τὴν Αἰτωλίαν. (11) ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ παρ' αὐτῶν ἐξέπεμψαν πάλιν πρεσβευτὰς εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην, Ἀλέξανδρον τὸν Ἴσιον ἐπικαλούμενον καὶ Φαινέαν, σὺν δὲ τούτοις Χάλεπον, ἔτι δ' Ἄλυπον τὸν Ἀμβρακιώτην καὶ Λύκωπον.

VIII: Polybios 21.29.1–2 and 9

Ὅτι κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον οἱ παρὰ τῶν Ἀθηναίων καὶ τῶν Ῥοδίων πρέσβεις ἦκον ἐπὶ τὸ στρατόπεδον τῶν Ῥωμαίων, συνεπιληψόμενοι τῶν διαλύσεων. (2) ὅ τε βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἀθαμάνων Ἀμύνανδρος παρεγένετο σπουδάζων ἐξελέσθαι τοὺς Ἀμβρακιώτας ἐκ τῶν περιεστώτων κακῶν.... (9) οἱ δὲ παρὰ τῶν Ἀθηναίων καὶ τῶν Ῥοδίων πρέσβεις λαμβάνοντες εἰς τὰς χεῖρας τὸν στρατηγὸν τῶν Ῥωμαίων καὶ ποικίλως ὁμιλοῦντες, πραΰνειν ἐπειρῶντο τὴν ὀργὴν αὐτοῦ.

IX: Polybios 21.30.6–7

Ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ὑπετυπώθη τότε κεφαλαιωδῶς περὶ τῶν διαλύσεων· ἔδει δὲ τούτοις πρῶτον μὲν εὐδοκῆσαι τοὺς Αἰτωλούς, μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα γίνεσθαι τὴν ἀναφορὰν ἐπὶ Ῥωμαίους. (7) οἱ μὲν οὖν Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ Ῥόδιοι παρέμενον αὐτοῦ, καραδοκοῦντες τὴν τῶν Αἰτωλῶν ἀπόφασιν· οἱ δὲ περὶ τὸν Δαμοτέλην ἐπανελθόντες διεσάφουν τοῖς Αἰτωλοῖς περὶ τῶν συγκεχωρημένων.

X: Polybios 21.30.15–21.31.5

Οἱ δ' Αἰτωλοὶ προχειρισάμενοι Φαινέαν καὶ Νίκανδρον πρεσβευτὰς ἐξέπεμψαν εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην περὶ τῆς εἰρήνης· (16) ἁπλῶς γὰρ οὐδὲν ἦν κύριον τῶν προειρημένων, εἰ μὴ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ δόξαι τῷ τῶν Ῥωμαίων. [31] οὗτοι μὲν οὖν παραλαβόντες τούς τε Ῥοδίους καὶ τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἔπλεον ἐπὶ τὸ προκείμενον· (2) παραπλησίως δὲ καὶ Μάρκος ἐξαπέστειλε Γάιον τὸν Οὐαλέριον καί τινας ἑτέρους τῶν φίλων πράξοντας τὰ περὶ τῆς εἰρήνης.

(3) ἀφικομένων δ' εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην, πάλιν ἐκαινοποιήθη τὰ τῆς ὀργῆς πρὸς Αἰτωλοὺς διὰ Φιλίππου τοῦ βασιλέως.... (5) διὸ καὶ τῶν μὲν Αἰτωλῶν εἰσπορευθέντων παρήκουεν ἡ σύγκλητος, τῶν δὲ Ῥοδίων καὶ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἀξιούντων ἐνετράπη καὶ προσέσχε τὸν νοῦν.

XI: Polybios 21.31.16

Ὁ μὲν οὖν Ἀθηναῖος ταῦτ' εἰπὼν ἔπεισε τὴν σύγκλητον διαλύεσθαι πρὸς τοὺς Αἰτωλούς.

In 190, the Athenians, in particular an individual by the name of Echedemos, were instrumental in mediating the initial abortive attempt at negotiations between the Aitolians and the Scipios.[1] The Athenians at first interceded on behalf of the Aitolians with Africanus and were then deputed by him to persuade the Aitolians to come to terms as well. Nevertheless, this initial attempt at mediation failed when Africanus's brother, the consul Lucius, made it clear that he was not prepared to offer the lenient terms at which Africanus had hinted. The Aitolians were surprised and distressed by this response; the Athenians, however, continued their attempts at mediation and managed at least to buy time in the form of a six-month armistice for the Aitolians. In the following year, 189, the news of Antiochos's defeat at Magnesia, combined with the failure of Aitolian envoys to obtain acceptable terms from the senate during the armistice, frightened the Aitolians badly, and this time the request for mediation originated with them. They requested Athens to act again on their behalf and invited Rhodes, Rome's friend and a state with a long history of acting as a mediator or arbitrator, to join Athens.[2] Both Athens and Rhodes sent representatives to the consul of 189, Fulvius, and succeeded in gaining provisional terms that were more favourable to the Aitolians (Polyb. 21.30.1–5; Livy 38.9.9–10). But while these terms proferred by the Roman consul in Greece were acceptable to the Aitolians, they were not valid until ratified by the Roman people. It was in Rome itself that the Rhodian and Athenian mediators, and in particular the Athenian Leon, played a decisive role. Upon their arrival in Rome, it was discovered that the prevailing attitude there was strongly anti-Aitolian. Polybios records that it was the intercession of the Athenian Leon especially that persuaded the Romans to ratify the settlement with Aitolia (Polyb. 21.31.5–16; Livy 38.10.4–6).

The mediation between Rome and Aitolia does appear to have worked both ways; in other words, at least in the case of Scipio Africanus, the Athenians were apparently not merely interceding as advocates on behalf of Aitolia but were acting also in the interest of the Romans. Although the initial attempt in

1. On Echedemos, a prominent Athenian citizen, see Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 3, pp. 94–95. For the "pro-Roman" stance of both Echedemos and Leon see Walbank, pp. 94, 131.

2. For other instances involving the arbitration of Rhodes, cf. **53**, **57**, **63**, **74**, **77**, **109**, **117**.

190 failed, it is significant that in 189 at least, Rome was willing to accept the interference of more or less neutral third parties and was willing to modify its own views accordingly. But in this case, a vital distinction must be drawn between mediation and binding arbitration. Rome, no less than the great Hellenistic powers, never submitted to the full arbitral authority of another state; it was not, however, opposed to the idea of advantageous mediation.[3]

95. Fabius Labeo attempts to reconcile the Cretan states (189)

Livy 37.60.3–6.

Van Effenterre, pp. 261–62; R. F. Willetts, *Aristocratic Society in Ancient Crete* (London, 1955) p. 238; id., *Ancient Crete: A Social History* (London and Toronto, 1965) p. 155; Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 3, p. 163; P. Brulé, *La piraterie crétoise hellénistique* (Paris, 1978) pp. 25f.; Briscoe, *Books XXXIV–XXXVII*, pp. 394f.

> Cydoniatae bellum adversus Gortynios Gnosiosque gerebant, et captivorum Romanorum atque Italici generis magnus numerus in servitute esse per totam insulam dicebatur. (4) classe ab Epheso profectus cum primum Cretae litus attigit, nuntios circa civitates misit ut armis absisterent captivosque in suis quaeque urbibus agrisque conquisitos reducerent, et legatos mitterent ad se, cum quibus de rebus ad Cretenses pariter Romanosque pertinentibus ageret. (5) nihil magnopere ea Cretenses moverunt; captivos praeter Gortynios nulli reddiderunt. Valerius Antias quattuor milia captivorum, quia belli minas timuerint, (6) ex tota insula reddita scripsit; eamque causam Fabio, cum rem nullam aliam gessisset, triumphi navalis impetrandi ab senatu fuisse.

In the aftermath of Rome's military victory over Antiochos, Manlius Vulso was given the consular command in Asia. Before dealing with Vulso's actions there, Livy digresses in order to discuss the Cretan adventures of the praetor in charge of the Aegean fleet, Q. Fabius Labeo.[1] Labeo crossed to the island and found it, as it often was, in a state of war and turmoil. Gortyn and Knossos, so frequently enemies, were actually allies in this particular conflict, and together they were engaged in fighting a third state, Kydonia. In addition to considering this state of war in Crete to be undesirable, the Roman praetor was

3. See the articles by Scafuro (*Historia* 36 [1987] pp. 28–37) and Eckstein (*Historia* 37 [1988] pp. 414–44).

1. This was the same Labeo who figures in the probably apocryphal tale of the Roman boundary arbitration between Nola and Naples (Cic. *Off.* 1.10.33), where he is said to have persuaded both sides separately to make territorial concessions, and to have awarded the resulting unclaimed strip of land between them to the Roman people.

190 failed, it is significant that in 189 at least, Rome was willing to accept the interference of more or less neutral third parties and was willing to modify its own views accordingly. But in this case, a vital distinction must be drawn between mediation and binding arbitration. Rome, no less than the great Hellenistic powers, never submitted to the full arbitral authority of another state; it was not, however, opposed to the idea of advantageous mediation.[3]

95. Fabius Labeo attempts to reconcile the Cretan states (189)

Livy 37.60.3–6.

Van Effenterre, pp. 261–62; R. F. Willetts, *Aristocratic Society in Ancient Crete* (London, 1955) p. 238; id., *Ancient Crete: A Social History* (London and Toronto, 1965) p. 155; Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 3, p. 163; P. Brulé, *La piraterie crétoise hellénistique* (Paris, 1978) pp. 25f.; Briscoe, *Books XXXIV–XXXVII*, pp. 394f.

> Cydoniatae bellum adversus Gortynios Gnosiosque gerebant, et captivorum Romanorum atque Italici generis magnus numerus in servitute esse per totam insulam dicebatur. (4) classe ab Epheso profectus cum primum Cretae litus attigit, nuntios circa civitates misit ut armis absisterent captivosque in suis quaeque urbibus agrisque conquisitos reducerent, et legatos mitterent ad se, cum quibus de rebus ad Cretenses pariter Romanosque pertinentibus ageret. (5) nihil magnopere ea Cretenses moverunt; captivos praeter Gortynios nulli reddiderunt. Valerius Antias quattuor milia captivorum, quia belli minas timuerint, (6) ex tota insula reddita scripsit; eamque causam Fabio, cum rem nullam aliam gessisset, triumphi navalis impetrandi ab senatu fuisse.

In the aftermath of Rome's military victory over Antiochos, Manlius Vulso was given the consular command in Asia. Before dealing with Vulso's actions there, Livy digresses in order to discuss the Cretan adventures of the praetor in charge of the Aegean fleet, Q. Fabius Labeo.[1] Labeo crossed to the island and found it, as it often was, in a state of war and turmoil. Gortyn and Knossos, so frequently enemies, were actually allies in this particular conflict, and together they were engaged in fighting a third state, Kydonia. In addition to considering this state of war in Crete to be undesirable, the Roman praetor was

3. See the articles by Scafuro (*Historia* 36 [1987] pp. 28–37) and Eckstein (*Historia* 37 [1988] pp. 414–44).

1. This was the same Labeo who figures in the probably apocryphal tale of the Roman boundary arbitration between Nola and Naples (Cic. *Off.* 1.10.33), where he is said to have persuaded both sides separately to make territorial concessions, and to have awarded the resulting unclaimed strip of land between them to the Roman people.

also dissatisfied with the fact that there were a great number of captives destined for slavery on the island, both Romans and Italians.[2] When Labeo arrived in Crete he sent messages to the effect that the various states should lay down their arms, restore the captives, and send ambassadors to him. They could then discuss "certain issues" that would be of interest to both Romans and Cretans.

If Labeo's mission was to pacify Crete and secure the release of the captives, it was largely a failure. The Cretans were not particularly interested in what he had to say. None of them acted on his suggestions, except for the Gortynians, who did restore the captives in their jurisdiction. Beyond that, Labeo's pacificatory mission accomplished nothing in Crete. For Labeo himself, however, it was another story. Livy says that the only reason Labeo went to Crete was that it looked to be as good a place as any to enhance his own *gloria* during his term in office. This he did achieve. He was given a naval triumph by the senate, according to Livy, for his return of four thousand captives. Labeo may have been looking for a way to balance and offset the current celebrity of the Scipios.[3] One way for Labeo to garner political prestige for himself, naturally, was to present himself to the Cretans as the mediator of their disputes, just as Flamininus had settled the affairs of the Greeks a few years previously, and as Vulso was about to do in Asia.[4] Rome had no official standing in Crete, and no legal right or obligation to settle Crete's quarrels. However, the distinction to be gained from the successful or even only partially successful attempt to pacify the island was an obvious goal for an ambitious politician, and Crete was certainly one part of the Greek world that offered eternal opportunities for foreign arbitrators, especially Romans.[5]

96. Conflict between the Achaian League and Sparta (188)

Livy 38.32.3–10.

De Ruggiero, chap. 12, no. 3; Berard, p. 109; Phillipson, pp. 155–56; J. A. O. Larsen, *CPh* 30 (1935) pp. 193–214; K. T. Chrimes, *Ancient Sparta* (Manchester, 1949) pp. 30f.; Badian, *FC*, pp. 89f.; Larsen (Frank), pp. 286f.; Larsen, *GFS*, pp. 448–49; Errington, *Philopoemen*, pp. 133f.; Shimron, pp. 101f.; E. S. Gruen, *JHS* 96 (1976) pp. 54f.; Will, vol. 2, pp. 242f.; Gruen, pp. 120f.; Piper, pp. 117–40; Bastini, pp. 67f.; Cartledge/Spawforth, *Sparta*, pp. 77f.

2. No doubt the result of piracy, at least in part. See Brulé, pp. 27f.; Briscoe, p. 395.

3. Briscoe, pp. 394–95; van Effenterre, p. 261.

4. See **76**, **98**.

5. Cf. **110**, **158**, **164**, and see van Effenterre, pp. 260f. Labeo may also have been interested in discussing the issue of Hannibal's presence at Gortyn after the battle of Magnesia.

also dissatisfied with the fact that there were a great number of captives destined for slavery on the island, both Romans and Italians.[2] When Labeo arrived in Crete he sent messages to the effect that the various states should lay down their arms, restore the captives, and send ambassadors to him. They could then discuss "certain issues" that would be of interest to both Romans and Cretans.

If Labeo's mission was to pacify Crete and secure the release of the captives, it was largely a failure. The Cretans were not particularly interested in what he had to say. None of them acted on his suggestions, except for the Gortynians, who did restore the captives in their jurisdiction. Beyond that, Labeo's pacificatory mission accomplished nothing in Crete. For Labeo himself, however, it was another story. Livy says that the only reason Labeo went to Crete was that it looked to be as good a place as any to enhance his own *gloria* during his term in office. This he did achieve. He was given a naval triumph by the senate, according to Livy, for his return of four thousand captives. Labeo may have been looking for a way to balance and offset the current celebrity of the Scipios.[3] One way for Labeo to garner political prestige for himself, naturally, was to present himself to the Cretans as the mediator of their disputes, just as Flamininus had settled the affairs of the Greeks a few years previously, and as Vulso was about to do in Asia.[4] Rome had no official standing in Crete, and no legal right or obligation to settle Crete's quarrels. However, the distinction to be gained from the successful or even only partially successful attempt to pacify the island was an obvious goal for an ambitious politician, and Crete was certainly one part of the Greek world that offered eternal opportunities for foreign arbitrators, especially Romans.[5]

96. Conflict between the Achaian League and Sparta (188)

Livy 38.32.3–10.

De Ruggiero, chap. 12, no. 3; Berard, p. 109; Phillipson, pp. 155–56; J. A. O. Larsen, *CPh* 30 (1935) pp. 193–214; K. T. Chrimes, *Ancient Sparta* (Manchester, 1949) pp. 30f.; Badian, *FC*, pp. 89f.; Larsen (Frank), pp. 286f.; Larsen, *GFS*, pp. 448–49; Errington, *Philopoemen*, pp. 133f.; Shimron, pp. 101f.; E. S. Gruen, *JHS* 96 (1976) pp. 54f.; Will, vol. 2, pp. 242f.; Gruen, pp. 120f.; Piper, pp. 117–40; Bastini, pp. 67f.; Cartledge/Spawforth, *Sparta*, pp. 77f.

2. No doubt the result of piracy, at least in part. See Brulé, pp. 27f.; Briscoe, p. 395.

3. Briscoe, pp. 394–95; van Effenterre, p. 261.

4. See **76**, **98**.

5. Cf. **110**, **158**, **164**, and see van Effenterre, pp. 260f. Labeo may also have been interested in discussing the issue of Hannibal's presence at Gortyn after the battle of Magnesia.

Hic tumultus consulem Peloponnesum adduxit, iussuque eius Elin concilio indicto Lacedaemonii ad disceptandum acciti. (4) magna ibi non disceptatio modo sed altercatio fuit, cui consul, cum alia satis ambitiose partem utramque fovendo incerta respondisset, una denuntiatione ut bello abstinerent, donec Romam ad senatum legatos misissent, finem imposuit. (5) utrimque legatio missa Romam est. exules quoque Lacedaemoniorum suam causam legationemque Achaeis iniunxerunt. (6) Diophanes et Lycortas, Megalopolitani ambo, principes legationis Achaeorum fuerunt qui, dissidentes in re publica, tum quoque minime inter se convenientes orationes habuerunt. (7) Diophanes senatui disceptationem omnium rerum permittebat: eos optime controversias inter Achaeos et Lacedaemonios finituros esse; (8) Lycortas ex praeceptis Philopoemenis postulabat ut Achaeis ex foedere ac legibus suis quae decressent agere liceret, libertatemque sibi illibatam, cuius ipsi auctores essent, praestarent. (9) magnae auctoritatis apud Romanos tum gens Achaeorum erat; novari tamen nihil de Lacedaemoniis placebat. ceterum responsum ita perplexum fuit ut et Achaei sibi de Lacedaemone permissum acciperent, (10) et Lacedaemonii non omnia concessa iis interpretarentur.

One of the most significant factors in Greek history and Greek relations with Rome in the second century B.C. was the hostility between Sparta and the Achaian League. Rome frequently played its own role in this conflict as mediator and arbitrator.[1] One of the first instances of Roman adjudication of this long-standing dispute came not long after the Achaian League had first annexed Sparta, following Nabis's death in 192. Pro- and anti-Achaian political factions within Sparta complicated its relationship with the League. There was also the thorny problem of the Spartan "exiles," victims of the various social upheavals and revolutions in that state over the past decades.[2] Many of these exiles had settled in the coastal towns that had been detached from Sparta and placed under Achaian protection. The matter of the exiles formed part of the raison d'être of Sparta's independent embassy to Rome in 191 (Polyb. 21.1). By the rules of the Achaian League, this embassy was illegal, since member cities of the League did not have the right to act as independent states in the sending of embassies. Nevertheless, throughout the history of its conflict with the Achaian League, Sparta consistently refused to conform to its rules and continued to act as an independent state in sending its own embassies to Rome.

The intent of the Spartan embassy was to ask the Romans to adjudicate certain issues: hostages taken from Nabis in 195, the problem of the coastal villages, and the matter of the "old exiles."[3] But the senate took no action on the

1. Cf. **111** and **147**.

2. See Piper, pp. 120f.; Errington, *Philopoemen*, p. 130. See also Shimron, App. A, pp. 135–50.

3. For discussions of the identification of "old" (versus "new") exiles, see Errington, pp. 133f.; Shimron, p. 139; Piper, pp. 120f.; Bastini, pp. 80f.

issue of the exiles or the perioikic towns, though Rome did belatedly (in 190) restore the hostages taken from Nabis. This initial Spartan attempt to get the Romans to play a vigorous role in resolving the tensions that plagued it, and its relationship with Achaia, had minimal effect. The situation continued to deteriorate, and when the Achaian League refused to countenance a Spartan military raid in 189 on one of the coastal towns under Achaian protection, Sparta responded by secession from the League (Livy 38.30–31).

The time was ripe for Sparta once again to induce the Romans to intervene in its dispute with Achaia. Sparta offered *deditio* to the Roman commander in Greece, M. Fulvius Nobilior, and Fulvius summoned both sides to meet with him at Elis, where he would listen to their claims. Fulvius, who apparently ignored the formalities of the *deditio*,[4] may have seen himself as a potentially successful mediator of this quarrel. He certainly seems to have taken the trouble to listen to the arguments; but in the end he clearly did not feel himself well-enough equipped, authorized, or interested to give a definitive judgement on the dispute. His final decision was that both sides were to maintain a truce until they had laid their case before the senate. The Achaians and the Spartans thereupon both sent embassies to argue their claims in Rome. Conflict of policy between the chief Achaian ambassadors, Lykortas and Diophanes (a conflict that was to repeat itself through the course of the second century), further complicated the issue. Diophanes urged that all disputes between Achaia and Sparta be submitted to the senate for total adjudication. Whatever the purpose behind Diophanes' stance of cooperation with Rome, in legalistic terms he was urging that Sparta be recognized as an independent entity, between whom and Achaia Rome would act as a neutral international arbitrator. Such a policy was diametrically opposed to that of Lykortas and Philopoimen. They insisted that the punishment of Sparta was a purely Achaian affair and of no importance to the Romans, who had no right to interfere.

Although the senate did not endorse this independent Achaian stance, its decision in the end was essentially in accord with it. It did not interfere. Instead, the Romans proclaimed an ambiguous solution on the basis of the status quo: "no change was to be made in the status of the Lakedaimonians." This response enabled the Spartans to believe that they would maintain some measure of freedom, while the Achaians chose to understand that they now had carte blanche where the Spartans were concerned. Essentially both sides were back where they had been before Fulvius's arrival in Greece. The Achaians extended Philopoimen's *strategia* another year, and in 188 he restored Sparta to the League yet again, this time under much harsher terms, including the destruction of Sparta's walls, the restoration of the exiles, and the abolition of the Lykourgan system (Livy 38.34). Hence the Roman role in this first series

4. See Gruen, p. 120.

of clashes between Achaia and the new member, Sparta, was in many ways negligible. The senate made no attempt to come up with a workable solution to the problems. This may have been the result of a deliberate Machiavellian manipulation of the situation in the Peloponnese, or it may simply have been a lack of concern for what was considered to be a Greek problem. Nevertheless, the mediatory role of the Romans had a certain significance, in that it inspired both sides to consider Rome increasingly as the arbitrator of their disputes in future. The tendency to appeal to Rome became in itself another point of contention between Sparta and Achaia over the next decades. Sparta was always quite willing to turn to Rome, whereas the more nationalistic of the Achaian politicians were continually aggrieved by this refusal on the part of Sparta to behave according to the rules of the League. Instead of rejecting the technically illegal Spartan embassies, the Romans accepted them and agreed to play the role of mediator between Achaia and Sparta as between two independent states.

97. The Peace of Apameia (188)

I: Polybios 21.43.24–27.
II: Livy 38.38.16–17.

Matthaei, *CQ*, pp. 244–45 n. 6; E. Täubler, *Imperium Romanum* I (Leipzig, 1913) pp. 443f.; Magie, *RRAM*, vol. 1, p. 113; Johnson et al., *ARS* 27; Préaux, pp. 271f.; Errington, *Dawn*, pp. 178–83; Klose, p. 144; Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 3, pp. 156–62; Austin 161; Will, vol. 2, pp. 221f.; Gruen, pp. 87f., 104, 110.

I: Polybios 21.43.24–27

Ἂν δέ τινες τῶν πόλεων ἢ τῶν ἐθνῶν, πρὸς ἃ γέγραπται μὴ πολεμεῖν Ἀντίοχον, πρότεροι ἐκφέρωσι πόλεμον, ἐξέστω πολεμεῖν Ἀντιόχῳ. (25) τῶν δὲ ἐθνῶν καὶ πόλεων τούτων μὴ ἐχέτω τὴν κυρίαν αὐτὸς μηδ' εἰς φιλίαν προσαγέσθω. (26) περὶ δὲ τῶν ἀδικημάτων τῶν πρὸς ἀλλήλους γινομένων εἰς κρίσιν προκαλείσθωσαν. (27) ἐὰν δέ τι θέλωσι πρὸς τὰς συνθήκας ἀμφότεροι κοινῷ δόγματι προστεθῆναι ἢ ἀφαιρεθῆναι ἀπ' αὐτῶν, ἐξέστω.

II: Livy 38.38.16–17

Si qui sociorum populi Romani ultro bellum inferent Antiocho, vim vi arcendi ius esto, dum ne quam urbem aut belli iure teneat aut in amicitiam accipiat. (17) controversias inter se iure ac iudicio disceptanto, aut, si utrisque placebit, bello.

The Treaty of Apameia, formulated at Rome over the year 189, and ratified by Antiochos in Syria in 188, put an end to Rome's war with Antiochos. Polybios

of clashes between Achaia and the new member, Sparta, was in many ways negligible. The senate made no attempt to come up with a workable solution to the problems. This may have been the result of a deliberate Machiavellian manipulation of the situation in the Peloponnese, or it may simply have been a lack of concern for what was considered to be a Greek problem. Nevertheless, the mediatory role of the Romans had a certain significance, in that it inspired both sides to consider Rome increasingly as the arbitrator of their disputes in future. The tendency to appeal to Rome became in itself another point of contention between Sparta and Achaia over the next decades. Sparta was always quite willing to turn to Rome, whereas the more nationalistic of the Achaian politicians were continually aggrieved by this refusal on the part of Sparta to behave according to the rules of the League. Instead of rejecting the technically illegal Spartan embassies, the Romans accepted them and agreed to play the role of mediator between Achaia and Sparta as between two independent states.

97. The Peace of Apameia (188)

I: Polybios 21.43.24–27.
II: Livy 38.38.16–17.

Matthaei, *CQ*, pp. 244–45 n. 6; E. Täubler, *Imperium Romanum* I (Leipzig, 1913) pp. 443f.; Magie, *RRAM*, vol. 1, p. 113; Johnson et al., *ARS* 27; Préaux, pp. 271f.; Errington, *Dawn*, pp. 178–83; Klose, p. 144; Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 3, pp. 156–62; Austin 161; Will, vol. 2, pp. 221f.; Gruen, pp. 87f., 104, 110.

I: Polybios 21.43.24–27

Ἂν δέ τινες τῶν πόλεων ἢ τῶν ἐθνῶν, πρὸς ἃ γέγραπται μὴ πολεμεῖν Ἀντίοχον, πρότεροι ἐκφέρωσι πόλεμον, ἐξέστω πολεμεῖν Ἀντιόχῳ. (25) τῶν δὲ ἐθνῶν καὶ πόλεων τούτων μὴ ἐχέτω τὴν κυρίαν αὐτὸς μηδ' εἰς φιλίαν προσαγέσθω. (26) περὶ δὲ τῶν ἀδικημάτων τῶν πρὸς ἀλλήλους γινομένων εἰς κρίσιν προκαλείσθωσαν. (27) ἐὰν δέ τι θέλωσι πρὸς τὰς συνθήκας ἀμφότεροι κοινῷ δόγματι προστεθῆναι ἢ ἀφαιρεθῆναι ἀπ' αὐτῶν, ἐξέστω.

II: Livy 38.38.16–17

Si qui sociorum populi Romani ultro bellum inferent Antiocho, vim vi arcendi ius esto, dum ne quam urbem aut belli iure teneat aut in amicitiam accipiat. (17) controversias inter se iure ac iudicio disceptanto, aut, si utrisque placebit, bello.

The Treaty of Apameia, formulated at Rome over the year 189, and ratified by Antiochos in Syria in 188, put an end to Rome's war with Antiochos. Polybios

quotes the terms of the treaty in full; it is from Polybios that Livy derives his own (rather peculiar) version, in which he inserts an odd clause about the availability of war as a future option.[1] One of the clauses in the peace treaty appears at first glance to provide that future disputes between the two signatories, Rome and Antiochos, are to be settled by arbitration.[2] This seems to be the natural interpretation, but it has been argued that any potential arbitration would be between Antiochos and other Eastern states with whom he might have a future disagreement, not between Antiochos and Rome. At most, the Roman role in any arbitration provided for by the Peace of Apameia would be that of the arbitrator.[3] It would certainly be startling to see Rome binding itself by treaty to future arbitration, particularly given Rome's generally cynical attitude towards Greek arbitration. It seems impossible that Rome and Antiochos would have thought they could find a suitable arbitrator; certainly not one who would have been acceptable to Rome.[4] It seems more likely, if this clause *is* to be applied to future disputes between Antiochos and Rome, that it was merely accepted into the treaty as an increasingly standardized attempt to provide for the settlement of potential disagreements without the ultimate step of going to war; but these would surely only have been disagreements that did not affect the vital interests of Rome. Rome very clearly did not participate in any arbitration, as arbitrator or as disputant, that might have threatened its own interests. In that case, perhaps Livy's mutilation of the text of Polybios might not seem so strange after all: the Romans might have been willing to settle minor disputes by arbitration, but the threat of war would always have been in the background.

98. The Roman settlement of Asia after the Antiochene War (188)

I: Polybios 21.24.4–6.
II: Polybios 21.46.1.
III: Livy 38.39.5 and 7.

1. See Gruen, p. 87; Préaux, p. 271.

2. Polyb. 21.43.26; Livy 38.38.17. The entry in Daremberg-Saglio (*Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines,* s.v. "amicitia") argues that the clause did envision arbitration between Antiochos and Rome.

3. The potential quarrels with other states are discussed in secs. 24–25 of the Polybios passage. See Täubler, Gruen, Matthaei, and Will for arguments favouring the view that this treaty called for arbitration between Antiochos and other Greek states, not Rome.

4. Cf. Préaux, p. 272: "De toute manière, l'arbitrage lui-même était illusoire, car on ne voit pas à quelle puissance Rome aurait reconnu, pour l'accepter comme arbitre, une force supérieure à la sienne."

quotes the terms of the treaty in full; it is from Polybios that Livy derives his own (rather peculiar) version, in which he inserts an odd clause about the availability of war as a future option.[1] One of the clauses in the peace treaty appears at first glance to provide that future disputes between the two signatories, Rome and Antiochos, are to be settled by arbitration.[2] This seems to be the natural interpretation, but it has been argued that any potential arbitration would be between Antiochos and other Eastern states with whom he might have a future disagreement, not between Antiochos and Rome. At most, the Roman role in any arbitration provided for by the Peace of Apameia would be that of the arbitrator.[3] It would certainly be startling to see Rome binding itself by treaty to future arbitration, particularly given Rome's generally cynical attitude towards Greek arbitration. It seems impossible that Rome and Antiochos would have thought they could find a suitable arbitrator; certainly not one who would have been acceptable to Rome.[4] It seems more likely, if this clause *is* to be applied to future disputes between Antiochos and Rome, that it was merely accepted into the treaty as an increasingly standardized attempt to provide for the settlement of potential disagreements without the ultimate step of going to war; but these would surely only have been disagreements that did not affect the vital interests of Rome. Rome very clearly did not participate in any arbitration, as arbitrator or as disputant, that might have threatened its own interests. In that case, perhaps Livy's mutilation of the text of Polybios might not seem so strange after all: the Romans might have been willing to settle minor disputes by arbitration, but the threat of war would always have been in the background.

98. The Roman settlement of Asia after the Antiochene War (188)

I: Polybios 21.24.4–6.
II: Polybios 21.46.1.
III: Livy 38.39.5 and 7.

1. See Gruen, p. 87; Préaux, p. 271.

2. Polyb. 21.43.26; Livy 38.38.17. The entry in Daremberg-Saglio (*Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines,* s.v. "amicitia") argues that the clause did envision arbitration between Antiochos and Rome.

3. The potential quarrels with other states are discussed in secs. 24–25 of the Polybios passage. See Täubler, Gruen, Matthaei, and Will for arguments favouring the view that this treaty called for arbitration between Antiochos and other Greek states, not Rome.

4. Cf. Préaux, p. 272: "De toute manière, l'arbitrage lui-même était illusoire, car on ne voit pas à quelle puissance Rome aurait reconnu, pour l'accepter comme arbitre, une force supérieure à la sienne."

Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene* T 528; Magie, *Buckler Studies*, p. 173; id., *RRAM*, vol. 1, p. 113; vol. 2, p. 964; Johnson et al., *ARS* 23; McShane, pp. 149f.; Hansen[2], pp. 92f.; C. Préaux, *Le monde hellénistique* II (Paris, 1978) p. 423; Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 3, pp. 164–74; Will, vol. 2, pp. 224f.; Berthold, pp. 162f.; Sherwin-White, pp. 22f.

I: Polybios 21.24.4–6

Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους εἰςῆγον, ὅσοι παρῆσαν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀσίας πρεσβεύοντες· ὧν ἐπὶ βράχυ μὲν διήκουσαν, ἅπασιν δὲ τὴν αὐτὴν ἔδωκαν ἀπόκριςιν. (5) αὕτη δ' ἦν ὅτι δέκα πρεσβεύοντας ἐξαποστελοῦσι τοὺς ὑπὲρ ἁπάντων τῶν ἀμφισβητουμένων ταῖς πόλεσι διαγνωσομένους. (6) δόντες δὲ ταύτας τὰς ἀποκρίσεις μετὰ ταῦτα κατέστησαν δέκα πρεσβευτάς, οἷς περὶ μὲν τῶν κατὰ μέρος ἔδωκαν τὴν ἐπιτροπήν, περὶ δὲ τῶν ὅλων αὐτοὶ διέλαβον. . . .

II: Polybios 21.46.1

Ὅτι κατὰ τὴν Ἀπάμειαν οἵ τε δέκα καὶ Γναῖος ὁ στρατηγὸς τῶν Ῥωμαίων, διακούσαντες πάντων τῶν ἀπηντηκότων, τοῖς μὲν περὶ χώρας ἢ χρημάτων ἢ τινος ἑτέρου διαφερομένοις πόλεις ἀπέδωκαν ὁμολογουμένας ἀμφοτέροις, ἐν αἷς διακριθήσονται περὶ τῶν ἀμφισβητουμένων.

III: Livy 38.39.5 and 7

Cn. Manlius cum inter cetera quae accipienda ab Antiocho erant elephantos quoque accepisset donoque Eumeni omnes dedisset, causas deinde civitatium, multis inter novas res turbatis, cognovit. . . . (7) civitatium autem cognitis causis decem legati aliam aliarum fecerunt condicionem.

Rome has been characterized as rather reluctant to arbitrate the affairs of the Greek states,[1] but Roman involvement in this role became inevitable through its own actions in the first decades of the second century. After the war with Antiochos and the Roman victory, Rome was recognized by the Greek states as the new dominant power in the Mediterranean. At a time when Rome was settling its own peace treaty with Antiochos, it was inundated with embassies from the Greek states requesting it to settle their differences as well. Many of the Greek city-states of Asia Minor at this time were of course concerned about their own situations with respect to the new power of Rome. Those states that had been on Antiochos's side were particularly concerned, and with good reason. But it is clear that the Greek states also exploited this opportunity in order to further their own interests, and, just as in the wake of the Second Macedonian War, numerous embassies appeared in Rome asking the Romans to settle a particular dispute.

1. See Gruen, chap. 3.

The Roman senate had little interest in spending its time listening to the lengthy and involved legal arguments natural to the Greek forms of arbitration. The senators did, of course, grant the time and patience to listen to the arguments of their allies, Eumenes and Rhodes (Polyb. 21.18–23; Livy 37.52–54). Both of them argued their cases at length before the senate, and the senators obligingly listened. Nevertheless, the opposition between Eumenes and Rhodes did not manifest itself on legal grounds. Rather it was motivated by political and territorial ambition, although Rhodes advertised itself as the champion of Greek liberty. Hence the arguments of Eumenes and Rhodes before the senate were based on an appeal to Roman policy, not Greek international law and custom.

For the majority of the cases, the delegates from the Greek states were informed that Rome would send out a commission of ten legates who, together with the Roman proconsul in Asia, Manlius Vulso, would settle all disputes. Even this commission, however, although it ensured that disputes were settled in a way agreeable to Rome, did not always undertake the task of arbitrating itself.[2] Many, at least, of the cases requiring arbitration were delegated to another Greek state, on which the disputants were agreed. The delegation of arbitral authority was not a startling departure in the world of diplomacy, and it became the common Roman approach to arbitration and mediation in the Hellenistic world.[3]

Polybios speaks of several of the individual arrangements made by the Roman legates. Although he does not deal with each case in great detail, it nevertheless seems that many of these settlements, referred to so briefly, could represent cases of arbitration. The grants of territory to Chios, Smyrna, Erythrai, and Phokaia (Polyb. 21.46.6–7), as also the restitution of the sacred land to Miletos (21.46.5), probably entailed arbitration. From a later inscription (**99** and **160**) we learn that Manlius Vulso was responsible for a judgement made in the dispute between Samos and Priene. It seems reasonable to assume that some of the other less-well-documented cases referred to briefly in this passage of Polybios may represent similar disputes.

2. The fact that the commission ensured the outcome of at least some of the decisions is clear from the fact that Rome's friends benefitted (and no doubt its enemies suffered); cf. Polyb. 21.46.

3. Delegation of an arbitrator was a common enough practice in the federal leagues, and Antigonos I had designated Mytilene as an ἔκκλητος πόλις for Teos and Lebedos (**13**). For later Roman arbitral function, see **100**, **120**, **131**, **159**, **164**.

99. Manlius Vulso decides the land dispute between Priene and Samos (188)

A pair of inscriptions recording two *senatus consulta* from a later period refer to the arbitration of Manlius. These inscriptions, editions, and further bibliography may be found in **160** (I and II). Only the relevant lines have been cited here.

Sonne 19; Berard 39, XII; Raeder 34, 3; Magie, *RRAM*, vol. 1, pp. 114; vol. 2, p. 965; Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 3, pp. 164. See also the bibliographies in **26**, **74**, **160**.

I: The *senatus consultum* from shortly before 135 B.C.

. . . καὶ περ[ὶ ὧν οἱ]
[ἀποσταλέντες παρὰ Πριηνέων πρεσβευταὶ ἄνδρες καλοὶ καὶ] ἀγαθοὶ καὶ φίλοι πα[ρὰ δήμου]
[καλοῦ καὶ ἀγαθοῦ καὶ φίλου λόγους ἐποιήσαντο συμμαχί]ᾳν τε ἀνενεώσαντο, [καὶ πε]-
[ρὶ τῆς χώρας ἣν λέγουσιν ἑαυτῶν γενέσθαι πρὶν ἐληλυ]θέναι εἰς ἐκείνην τὴν χώραν Μ[άν]-
[λιον καὶ τοὺς δέκα πρεσβευτάς, ὅπως ταύτην ἔχ]ωσιν· . . .

II: The *senatus consultum* from 135 B.C.

. . . πε]ρὶ ὧν Σάμιοι πρεσβευταὶ Τηλέμαχος Μάτρωνος, Λέων Λέοντος,
ἄνδρες κα[λοὶ κ]αὶ ἀγαθοὶ καὶ φίλοι παρὰ δ̣ήμο[υ καλοῦ] καὶ ἀγαθοῦ καὶ φίλου συμμάχου τε ἡμετέρου ᵛ λόγους ἐποήσαντο
κατὰ πρό[ϲ]ωπον πρὸς Πριην[ε]ῖϲ π[ερὶ χ]ώ̣ρας [καὶ ὁρίων, ὅπως ὧϲιν] καθὼς Γναῖο{ι}ϲ Μάνλιος καὶ οἱ δέκα πρεσβευταὶ διέταξαν
[μετὰ τὸν πρὸς Ἀντίοχον πόλεμον·. . .]

Both of these texts record senatorial decisions from the later second century in the interminable border dispute between Samos and Priene.[1] From these documents we learn that the proconsul Manlius Vulso and his commission of ten senators in Asia in 188 had apparently made a decision in the dispute, a decision that overturned the Rhodian judgement made less than a decade before (**74**). The records of some fifty years later give little in the way of detail; though it does seem that this decision, at any rate, was made by the proconsul himself and his commission, since no mention is made of the task of arbitration being delegated to another Greek state. Rhodes had arbitrated this dispute with great care and attention to detail, yet Vulso overturned the Rhodian judgement with little compunction, awarding the land to Samos. It is worth noting that the senate several decades later supported Priene's claims and reversed the decision

1. See **26**, **74**, and **160**.

of its own commission under Vulso; the grounds for the senatorial decision in 135 were that the Rhodian decision had been made with the blessing of both sides, and the senate therefore could not ignore it. It has been claimed that the first Roman decision in the case, that of Vulso, was the result of bribery, and that the senate later (some fifty years later!) felt some obligation to deny it.[2] This may be true, although it should be added that Manlius may have been moved by political considerations as well. The pattern of the general settlement of Asia (**98**) suggests that the relationship of the various states with Rome influenced the decisions undertaken by the commission, and Samos had proved to be of strategic value to Rome's allies during the war with Antiochos.[3]

100. Smyrna arbitrates between Miletos and Priene, perhaps at the request of Rome (after 188?)

Three fragments of an inscription from the wall of the Athena temple at Priene. A: h: 0.14 m; w: 0.33 m. B: h: 0.23 m; w: 0.26 m. C: h: 0.07 m; w: 0.10 m.

Hicks, *BMus* 412; Berard 38; *Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene* 27; F. Schroeter, "De Regum Hellenisticorum Epistulis" (Diss., Leipzig, 1931) frag. 20 (A); Welles, *RC* 46.

Sonne 30; Lenschau, *LS*, pp. 206f.; Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene*, pp. 212–13; Raeder 66; F. Mezger, *Inscriptio Milesiaca* (Munich, 1913) pp. 24f.; Tod 67; C. Préaux, *Le monde hellénistique* II (Paris, 1978) p. 423 n. 1; Daverio Rocchi, pp. 170–77; F. Piejko, *Opuscula Atheniensia* 18 (1990) p. 153.

A [- - - - - - ἀποτ]ε̣ίςηι πρὸς το- - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - ὑπ' ἐκείνων καὶ μ- - - - - - - - - - - - -
[- - ὡριςμέ]νηι προθεςμία[ι - - - - - - - - - - - -]
- - - - - - - Ἀλκίμου, Ἀντ- - - - - - - - - - - - - -
5 - - - - - - - - -ας Ἐπινίκο[υ - - - - - - - - - - -]
[- καθάπερ]
B [- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - γέ]γραφα τὴν ἐπιστολὴν
[- - - - - - - - - - ἐν ἡμέρ]αις ἑκατὸν εἴκοςι. ἔρρωςθε.
[κατὰ τάδε Μιλη̣ςίοις καὶ Πρι]ηνεῦςιν ὅρια ςτηςάτωςαν
10 [οἱ ὁρι̣ςταί, καθὼς ἔκρινεν ὁ Σμ]υρναίων δῆμος ἐν αὐτοῖς
[τοῖς τόποις, παρόντων μαρτύρ]ων παρά τε Μιλη̣ςίων καὶ Πριη-
[νέων, ὅπως ἂν - - - - - - -] προνοηθῆι, ἵν' ἕκαςτα πραχθῆι
[κατὰ τὴν τοῦ Σμυρναῖων δ]ήμου κρίςιν· καὶ ἐπαχθέντων

2. Manlius had a certain reputation for greed; cf. Polyb. 21.35.4 and Livy 38.42.11 and 38.45, and see Raeder, p. 71.

3. See Shipley, pp. 197–98.

of its own commission under Vulso; the grounds for the senatorial decision in 135 were that the Rhodian decision had been made with the blessing of both sides, and the senate therefore could not ignore it. It has been claimed that the first Roman decision in the case, that of Vulso, was the result of bribery, and that the senate later (some fifty years later!) felt some obligation to deny it.[2] This may be true, although it should be added that Manlius may have been moved by political considerations as well. The pattern of the general settlement of Asia (**98**) suggests that the relationship of the various states with Rome influenced the decisions undertaken by the commission, and Samos had proved to be of strategic value to Rome's allies during the war with Antiochos.[3]

100. Smyrna arbitrates between Miletos and Priene, perhaps at the request of Rome (after 188?)

Three fragments of an inscription from the wall of the Athena temple at Priene. A: h: 0.14 m; w: 0.33 m. B: h: 0.23 m; w: 0.26 m. C: h: 0.07 m; w: 0.10 m.

Hicks, *BMus* 412; Berard 38; *Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene* 27; F. Schroeter, "De Regum Hellenisticorum Epistulis" (Diss., Leipzig, 1931) frag. 20 (A); Welles, *RC* 46.

Sonne 30; Lenschau, *LS*, pp. 206f.; Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene*, pp. 212–13; Raeder 66; F. Mezger, *Inscriptio Milesiaca* (Munich, 1913) pp. 24f.; Tod 67; C. Préaux, *Le monde hellénistique* II (Paris, 1978) p. 423 n. 1; Daverio Rocchi, pp. 170–77; F. Piejko, *Opuscula Atheniensia* 18 (1990) p. 153.

A [- - - - - - ἀποτ]ε̣ίςηι πρὸς το- - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - ὑπ' ἐκείνων καὶ μ- - - - - - - - - - - - -
[- - ὡριςμέ]νηι προθεςμία[ι - - - - - - - - - - - -]
- - - - - - - Ἀλκίμου, Ἀντ- - - - - - - - - - - - - -
5 - - - - - - - - -ας Ἐπινίκο[υ - - - - - - - - - - -]
[- καθάπερ]
B [- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - γέ]γραφα τὴν ἐπιστολὴν
[- - - - - - - - - - ἐν ἡμέρ]αις ἑκατὸν εἴκοςι. ἔρρωςθε.
[κατὰ τάδε Μιλη̣ςίοις καὶ Πρι]ηνεῦςιν ὅρια ςτηςάτωςαν
10 [οἱ ὁρι̣ςταί, καθὼς ἔκρινεν ὁ Σμ]υρναίων δῆμος ἐν αὐτοῖς
[τοῖς τόποις, παρόντων μαρτύρ]ων παρά τε Μιλη̣ςίων καὶ Πριη-
[νέων, ὅπως ἂν - - - - - - -] προνοηθῆι, ἵν' ἕκαςτα πραχθῆι
[κατὰ τὴν τοῦ Σμυρναῖων δ]ήμου κρίςιν· καὶ ἐπαχθέντων

2. Manlius had a certain reputation for greed; cf. Polyb. 21.35.4 and Livy 38.42.11 and 38.45, and see Raeder, p. 71.

3. See Shipley, pp. 197–98.

[τῶν δικαστῶν - - - - - καθ'] ὃν ἠβουλήθησαν αὐτοὶ χρό-
[νον, ποιουμένων τε πᾶσαν σπ]ουδὴν καὶ φιλοτιμίαν ἵνα
[- - - - - - - - - - - - - μ]ενα πράγματα καὶ τὸν ἐνε-
[στῶτα - - - - - - - - - -]ραν ἀποτριψαμένων πα-
- -
C [- - - - γέ]γραπτα[ι - - - - -]
- - - - - -οι τὰ προ- - - - -
- - - - - -ρc- - - - - - - - -

1: -εύσηι πρὸς τὸ: Hicks, Berard. πρὸς τὸ [δημόσιον or βασιλικόν]: Welles. || 5: -ας ἐπὶ Νικο-: Hicks, Berard. || Hicks, followed by Berard, joined fragment C to the beginning of fragment B (lines 6f.) and suggested the following restoration: [καθάπερ| παραγέ]γραπτα[ι κατὰ ταὐτὰ γέ]γραπφα τὴν ἐπιστολὴν| [ποιεῖν μ]οι τὰ πρό[σφορα ἐν ἡμέρ]αις ἑκατὸν εἴκοσι. ἔρρωσθε.| [οἱ ὁρι]σ[ταὶ? Μιλησίοις κτλ.]. Hiller von Gaertringen dismissed this proposal on the grounds of the differing line intervals in B and C. || 7: [ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας γέ]γραπφα: Welles. || 10: [καθὼς αὐτοῖς διώρισεν τὴν γῆν ὁ Σμ]υρναίων δῆμος: Hicks, Berard. || 11: [παρόντων πρεσβευτ]ῶν: Hicks, Berard. || 12: [ὅπως ἂν πάσηι σπουδῆι]: Hicks, Berard. || 13–14: ἐπαχθέντων| [ἐκ τῆς ἑκατέρων πόλεως]: Hicks, Berard. || 15–16: ἵνα| [εἰς τὸ βέλτιον τιθῶσι τὰ γενόμ]ενα πράγματα: Hicks, Berard. || 16–17: τὸν ἐνε|[στῶτα πόλεμον?, μηδεμίαν ἡμέ]ραν ἀποτριψαμένων: Hicks, Berard. || 16–18: [διαλλάσσηται τὰ ἀμφισβητού]μενα πράγματα καὶ τὸν ἐνε|[στῶτα αὐτοῖς ζῆλον καὶ διαφο]ρὰν ἀποτριψαμένων πά|[λιν εἰς τὴν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἀποκατεστάθησαν φιλίαν]: Piejko.

This document was inscribed on the now fragmented wall blocks from the temple of Athene Polias in Priene, the same venue as several other records important to the city.[1] The first lines of the inscription contain the remains of a letter regarding an arbitration concerning a disputed piece of land between Miletos and Priene.[2] This letter may have set a time limit of 120 days for the performance of the task outlined in the document appended to it. The latter document regulated the judgement in the affair and required that the boundary between the two states be demarcated according to the award of the people of Smyrna. Clearly some previous judgement had been given in this case, apparently by the δῆμος of Smyrna. This had taken place fairly recently, or else there had been some other reason for delay, as the boundary stones were not yet erected. This was to be the task of the present boundary commission, convened by the authority of the letter writer. We cannot tell in whose favour the first award was made, but perhaps appeals reached the letter writer from both sides, both to enforce the decision that had been made and to repeal it. The

1. Cf. **74, 99**. Hicks's restorations and the conclusions he based on them are very dubious; Hiller von Gaertringen rejected most of them but emphasized that his own conjectures were open to question.

2. Cf. **171** for further disputes between Miletos and Priene.

original judgement was upheld, and while we are not told who the boundary commissioners were to be, it is not impossible that they were Smyrnaians.[3]

As for the letter, conjectures as to its source have ranged through various Hellenistic kings to a Roman proconsul.[4] A tempting reconstruction of events is to assign this letter to Manlius Vulso's presence in Asia in 188, when he settled numerous disputes between the Greek cities (**98**, **99**). These cities could well have appealed to him, hoping that he would reverse recent decisions in their favour. In the case of Priene's dispute with Samos, Samos must have appealed to Vulso, who reversed the Rhodian decision of the 190s. In the present case he could have requested an unknown party, perhaps Smyrna itself, to carry out the physical demarcation of boundaries, confirming the previous judgement made by that city. Smyrna had been an enthusiastic supporter of Rome in the war with Antiochos and could be relied on to perform such a task.[5]

101. Rome settles a boundary dispute between Mylasa and Stratonikeia (after 188)

A marble fragment discovered at Mylasa. H: 0.2 m; w: 0.42 m.

M. Dubois/A. Hauvette-Besnault, *BCH* 5 (1881) pp. 101–5, no. 6; Berard 42; *Blümel, *IMylasa* 134.

Sonne 26, 96; Raeder 58; Tod 71.

[- - - - - - - τὴ]ν χώραν καὶ ἀπὸ [τῆς c]υγκλήτου Δ- - - - - - - - - - -
[?πρὸς] Στρατονικεῖς ὑπὲρ τῆς χώρας αὐθεντικὴν εἰσεφέρετο σπουδήν, ὥστε
[διὰ] τοῦτον κατορθωθῆναι τῆι τε φυλῆι καὶ τῆι πόλει τὰ πράγματα· ἔγδικος
[δὲ ὑπ]ὸ τοῦ δήμου κατασταθεὶς κατὰ τῶν φθειράντων τὰ ξενικὰ δικαστήρια,
5 [τοὺς] πλείστους ἤδη τῶν ἀγώνων μετὰ τῶν συνκαθεσταμένων ἐκδίκων τετέλε-
[κεν] ἐπιμελῶς καὶ δυνατῶς, αὐθεντικὴν εἰσφερόμενος ὑπὲρ τῶν πᾶσι διαφερόν-
[των] εἰς τὴν ἀσφάλειαν τοῦ βίου σπουδήν, τῆς μὲν ἐπακολουθούσης πρὸς τοὺς ἐν

3. Although it appears that the boundary commissioners are to be distinguished from the Smyrnaians (cf. Sonne 30), the distinction should perhaps be between the Smyrnaian *people*, who are said to have arbitrated here, and a special board that would go over the actual site.

4. Ptolemy III: Hicks and Lenschau (also Seleukos II); but the weight of opinion favours a Roman source for the letter (Hiller von Gaertringen, Wilamowitz, Welles). Stylistic dating suggests the early second century.

5. Another possibility is to relate these documents to the circumstances following the war between Miletos and Magnesia in the 180s, and the peace settlement that followed (**109**). Priene had fought as an ally of Magnesia and could have required the arbitration of a third party in settling its rival claims with Miletos.

original judgement was upheld, and while we are not told who the boundary commissioners were to be, it is not impossible that they were Smyrnaians.[3]

As for the letter, conjectures as to its source have ranged through various Hellenistic kings to a Roman proconsul.[4] A tempting reconstruction of events is to assign this letter to Manlius Vulso's presence in Asia in 188, when he settled numerous disputes between the Greek cities (**98**, **99**). These cities could well have appealed to him, hoping that he would reverse recent decisions in their favour. In the case of Priene's dispute with Samos, Samos must have appealed to Vulso, who reversed the Rhodian decision of the 190s. In the present case he could have requested an unknown party, perhaps Smyrna itself, to carry out the physical demarcation of boundaries, confirming the previous judgement made by that city. Smyrna had been an enthusiastic supporter of Rome in the war with Antiochos and could be relied on to perform such a task.[5]

101. Rome settles a boundary dispute between Mylasa and Stratonikeia (after 188)

A marble fragment discovered at Mylasa. H: 0.2 m; w: 0.42 m.

M. Dubois/A. Hauvette-Besnault, *BCH* 5 (1881) pp. 101–5, no. 6; Berard 42; *Blümel, *IMylasa* 134.

Sonne 26, 96; Raeder 58; Tod 71.

[- - - - - - - τὴ]ν χώραν καὶ ἀπὸ [τῆς c]υγκλήτου Δ- - - - - - - - - - -
[?πρὸς] Στρατονικεῖς ὑπὲρ τῆς χώρας αὐθεντικὴν εἰσεφέρετο σπουδήν, ὥστε
[διὰ] τοῦτον κατορθωθῆναι τῆι τε φυλῆι καὶ τῆι πόλει τὰ πράγματα· ἔγδικος
[δὲ ὑπ]ὸ τοῦ δήμου κατασταθεὶς κατὰ τῶν φθειράντων τὰ ξενικὰ δικαστήρια,
5 [τοὺς] πλείστους ἤδη τῶν ἀγώνων μετὰ τῶν συνκαθεσταμένων ἐκδίκων τετέλε-
[κεν] ἐπιμελῶς καὶ δυνατῶς, αὐθεντικὴν εἰσφερόμενος ὑπὲρ τῶν πᾶσι διαφερόν-
[των] εἰς τὴν ἀσφάλειαν τοῦ βίου σπουδήν, τῆς μὲν ἐπακολουθούσης πρὸς τοὺς ἐν

3. Although it appears that the boundary commissioners are to be distinguished from the Smyrnaians (cf. Sonne 30), the distinction should perhaps be between the Smyrnaian *people*, who are said to have arbitrated here, and a special board that would go over the actual site.

4. Ptolemy III: Hicks and Lenschau (also Seleukos II); but the weight of opinion favours a Roman source for the letter (Hiller von Gaertringen, Wilamowitz, Welles). Stylistic dating suggests the early second century.

5. Another possibility is to relate these documents to the circumstances following the war between Miletos and Magnesia in the 180s, and the peace settlement that followed (**109**). Priene had fought as an ally of Magnesia and could have required the arbitration of a third party in settling its rival claims with Miletos.

[ταῖ]ς αἰτίαις ὄντας καὶ τοὺς ἰδίους τούτων ἀπεχθείας λόγον οὐ ποιούμενος, πρὸ
[πλεί]στου δὲ τιθέμενος τὸ τῆι πόλει κοινῶς καὶ πᾶσιν ἰδίαι συμφέρον, συν-κατωρ-
[θω]κὼς δὲ ἤδη τοὺς πλείστου[ς τῶν ἀ]γώνων συνδιαπεφύλακχεν τῇ πόλει
[τοὺ]ς νόμους καὶ τὴν ἀπὸ [τῶν δικαστηρί]ων ἀσφάλειαν ὥστε ἕκαστον ἔ-
[χειν] τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν κριναμένων - - - - -]ΤΗΝ ἀσφαλείαν τοῦ βίου πεμ-
[?φθεὶ]ς ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμο[υ - - - - - - -]ΗΝΑΣΤΩΝ- - -Τ- -Υ- - - - - - - -

3: κατ[ω]ρθωκέναι: Dubois/Hauvette-Besnault, Berard. || 12: [τ]ὴν: Dubois /Hauvette-Besnault.

Berard restored the lost portion at the beginning of the inscription as follows:

[Ἐπειδὴ ὁ -, ἐπεὶ ἡμῶν τῆι πόλει]
[Στρατονικεῖς ἐκ πόλλου χρόνου ἠμφισβήτουν περὶ τῆς χώρας - - -]
[καὶ τὸ τελευταῖον εἰσηλθον εἰς τὴν σύγκλητον καὶ μικροῦ τὴν ἀμφισβη]-
[τουμένη]ν χώραν καὶ ἀπὸ [τῆς c]υγκλήτου δ[όγματος]
[ἔλαχον] Στρατονικεῖς [ὑπὲρ τῆς χώρας αὐθεντικὴν εἰσεφέρετο σπουδήν, ὥστε]
[μόνον] τοῦτον κατ[ω]ρθωκέναι τῆι τε φυλῆι καὶ τῆι πόλει τὰ γράμματα - - - -

This second-century inscription is a decree from the Carian city of Mylasa, recording honours for an unknown citizen. This appears to be a "multiple" decree, of the sort that honoured not merely one but a whole series of benefactions carried out for the state by a particular individual.[1] Among other functions, the Mylasan citizen acted as Mylasa's advocate in an arbitration over a disputed piece of territory. The other claimant of the land, and the loser in this case, was the state of Stratonikeia. The arbitrator was evidently the Roman senate, since Mylasa appears to have been awarded the land by a *senatus consultum*.[2] Unfortunately the arbitration was probably dealt with in more detail in the portion missing from the top of the inscription. What is left is a description of our unknown individual's actions in other circumstances.

The appearance of Rome suggests that this inscription should be dated to the period after Rome's victory over Antiochos and the Roman settlement of Asia Minor. We might even wish to date this event still later in the second century, to the time when Rhodes had lost control of Stratonikeia. Given the predominance of Rhodes in this region after 188, and the fact that it so often acted as an arbitrator itself, the presence of Rome rather than Rhodes in this inscription may point to a date after 167. The fragmented state of the inscription, especially vis-à-vis the boundary arbitration, should make us hesitate to assert

1. Cf. **130**, **161**.

2. Such a *senatus consultum* would probably have laid down general guidelines and left the actual task of judgement to others; or, conversely, it might have ratified a preliminary decision made by others, such as Rome's legates in Asia Minor.

that Rhodes was definitely *not* involved; nevertheless, the fact that the disputants turned to Rome at all may suggest a time when the Roman influence was eclipsing the Rhodian.

102. Roman intervention between Rhodes and Lycia (188 and later)

I: Polybios 22.5.1–4.
II: Polybios 25.4.5–8.
III: Livy 41.6.11–12.
IV: Polybios 25.5.4–6.1.

Meyer, *Grenzen,* pp. 56–58; Magie, *Buckler Studies,* p. 172; P. M. Fraser/G. E. Bean, *The Rhodian Peraea and the Islands* (Oxford, 1954) pp. 107–17; H. H. Schmitt, *Rom und Rhodos* (Munich, 1957) pp. 93f.; Larsen, *GFS,* pp. 245–47; Errington, *Dawn,* pp. 192f.; E. S. Gruen, *CQ* 25 (1975) pp. 58–81; Walbank, *Comm,* vol. 3, pp. 181–84, 277–81; Will, vol. 2, pp. 295f.; Berthold, pp. 167–78; Gruen, p. 123; Sherwin-White, pp. 22f.; Eckstein, *Historia* 37 (1988) pp. 422–23.

I: Polybios 22.5.1–4

Ὅτι ἐγένετο Λυκίοις διαφορὰ πρὸς Ῥοδίους διὰ τοιαύτας αἰτίας. (2) καθ' οὓς καιροὺς οἱ δέκα διῴκουν τὰ περὶ τὴν Ἀσίαν, τότε παρεγενήθησαν πρέσβεις, παρὰ μὲν Ῥοδίων Θεαίδητος καὶ Φιλόφρων, ἀξιοῦντες αὐτοῖς δοθῆναι τὰ κατὰ Λυκίαν καὶ Καρίαν χάριν τῆς εὐνοίας καὶ προθυμίας, ἣν παρέσχηνται σφίσι κατὰ τὸν Ἀντιοχικὸν πόλεμον· (3) παρὰ δὲ τῶν Ἰλιέων ἦκον Ἵππαρχος καὶ Σάτυρος, ἀξιοῦντες διὰ τὴν πρὸς αὐτοὺς οἰκειότητα συγγνώμην δοθῆναι Λυκίοις τῶν ἡμαρτημένων. (4) ὧν οἱ δέκα διακούσαντες ἐπειράθησαν ἑκατέρων στοχάσασθαι κατὰ τὸ δυνατόν. διὰ μὲν γὰρ τοὺς Ἰλιεῖς οὐθὲν ἐβουλεύσαντο περὶ αὐτῶν ἀνήκεστον, τοῖς δὲ Ῥοδίοις χαριζόμενοι προσένειμαν ἐν δωρεᾷ τοὺς Λυκίους.

II: Polybios 25.4.5–8

Καὶ τέλος εἰς τοῦτ' ἤγαγον τὴν σύγκλητον, ὥστε πέμψαι πρεσβευτὰς εἰς τὴν Ῥόδον τοὺς διασαφήσοντας ὅτι, τῶν ὑπομνηματισμῶν ἀναληφθέντων ⟨ὧν⟩ οἱ δέκα πρέσβεις ἐποιήσαντο κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν, ὅτε τὰ πρὸς Ἀντίοχον ἐχείριζον, εὑρηνται Λύκιοι δεδομένοι Ῥοδίοις οὐκ ἐν δωρεᾷ, τὸ δὲ πλεῖον ὡς φίλοι καὶ σύμμαχοι. (6) τοιαύτης δὲ γενομένης διαλύσεως, οὐδ' ὅλως ἤρεσκε πολλοῖς τὸ γεγονός. (7) ἐδόκουν γὰρ οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι τὰ κατὰ τοὺς Ῥοδίους καὶ Λυκίους διαγωνοθετεῖν, θέλοντες ἐκδαπανᾶσθαι τὰς παραθέσεις τῶν Ῥοδίων καὶ τοὺς θησαυρούς, (8) ἀκηκοότες τήν τε νυμφαγωγίαν τὴν νεωστὶ τῷ Περσεῖ γεγενημένην ὑπ' αὐτῶν καὶ τὴν ἀνάπειραν τῶν πλοίων.

that Rhodes was definitely *not* involved; nevertheless, the fact that the disputants turned to Rome at all may suggest a time when the Roman influence was eclipsing the Rhodian.

102. Roman intervention between Rhodes and Lycia (188 and later)

I: Polybios 22.5.1–4.
II: Polybios 25.4.5–8.
III: Livy 41.6.11–12.
IV: Polybios 25.5.4–6.1.

Meyer, *Grenzen,* pp. 56–58; Magie, *Buckler Studies,* p. 172; P. M. Fraser/G. E. Bean, *The Rhodian Peraea and the Islands* (Oxford, 1954) pp. 107–17; H. H. Schmitt, *Rom und Rhodos* (Munich, 1957) pp. 93f.; Larsen, *GFS,* pp. 245–47; Errington, *Dawn,* pp. 192f.; E. S. Gruen, *CQ* 25 (1975) pp. 58–81; Walbank, *Comm,* vol. 3, pp. 181–84, 277–81; Will, vol. 2, pp. 295f.; Berthold, pp. 167–78; Gruen, p. 123; Sherwin-White, pp. 22f.; Eckstein, *Historia* 37 (1988) pp. 422–23.

I: Polybios 22.5.1–4

Ὅτι ἐγένετο Λυκίοις διαφορὰ πρὸς Ῥοδίους διὰ τοιαύτας αἰτίας. (2) καθ' οὓς καιροὺς οἱ δέκα διῴκουν τὰ περὶ τὴν Ἀσίαν, τότε παρεγενήθησαν πρέσβεις, παρὰ μὲν Ῥοδίων Θεαίδητος καὶ Φιλόφρων, ἀξιοῦντες αὐτοῖς δοθῆναι τὰ κατὰ Λυκίαν καὶ Καρίαν χάριν τῆς εὐνοίας καὶ προθυμίας, ἣν παρέσχηνται σφίσι κατὰ τὸν Ἀντιοχικὸν πόλεμον· (3) παρὰ δὲ τῶν Ἰλιέων ἦκον Ἵππαρχος καὶ Σάτυρος, ἀξιοῦντες διὰ τὴν πρὸς αὐτοὺς οἰκειότητα συγγνώμην δοθῆναι Λυκίοις τῶν ἡμαρτημένων. (4) ὧν οἱ δέκα διακούσαντες ἐπειράθησαν ἑκατέρων στοχάσασθαι κατὰ τὸ δυνατόν. διὰ μὲν γὰρ τοὺς Ἰλιεῖς οὐθὲν ἐβουλεύσαντο περὶ αὐτῶν ἀνήκεστον, τοῖς δὲ Ῥοδίοις χαριζόμενοι προσένειμαν ἐν δωρεᾷ τοὺς Λυκίους.

II: Polybios 25.4.5–8

Καὶ τέλος εἰς τοῦτ' ἤγαγον τὴν σύγκλητον, ὥστε πέμψαι πρεσβευτὰς εἰς τὴν Ῥόδον τοὺς διασαφήσοντας ὅτι, τῶν ὑπομνηματισμῶν ἀναληφθέντων ⟨ὧν⟩ οἱ δέκα πρέσβεις ἐποιήσαντο κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν, ὅτε τὰ πρὸς Ἀντίοχον ἐχείριζον, εὑρηνται Λύκιοι δεδομένοι Ῥοδίοις οὐκ ἐν δωρεᾷ, τὸ δὲ πλεῖον ὡς φίλοι καὶ σύμμαχοι. (6) τοιαύτης δὲ γενομένης διαλύσεως, οὐδ' ὅλως ἤρεσκε πολλοῖς τὸ γεγονός. (7) ἐδόκουν γὰρ οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι τὰ κατὰ τοὺς Ῥοδίους καὶ Λυκίους διαγωνοθετεῖν, θέλοντες ἐκδαπανᾶσθαι τὰς παραθέσεις τῶν Ῥοδίων καὶ τοὺς θησαυρούς, (8) ἀκηκοότες τήν τε νυμφαγωγίαν τὴν νεωστὶ τῷ Περσεῖ γεγενημένην ὑπ' αὐτῶν καὶ τὴν ἀνάπειραν τῶν πλοίων.

III: Livy 41.6.11–12

Motus his senatus litteras Lyciis ad Rhodios dedit, nec Lycios Rhodiis nec ullos alii cuiquam qui nati liberi sint in servitutem dari placere; (12) Lycios ita sub Rhodiorum simul imperio et tutela esse ut in dicione populi Romani civitates sociae sint.

IV: Polybios 25.5.4–6.1

Οὐ μὴν ἀλλ' οἵ γε Ῥόδιοι (δι)ακούσαντες τῶν πρεσβευτῶν καὶ νομίσαντες ἐξηπατῆσθαι τοὺς Ῥωμαίους ὑπὸ τῶν Λυκίων, παραχρῆμα κατέστησαν τοὺς περὶ Λυκόφρονα πρεσβευτάς, διδάξοντας τὴν σύγκλητον περὶ τῶν προειρημένων. (5) καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ἐπὶ τούτων ἦν, ὅσον οὔπω δοκούντων πάλιν ἐπαναστήσεσθαι τῶν Λυκίων. [6] ὅτι ἡ σύγκλητος, παραγενομένων τῶν ἐκ τῆς Ῥόδου πρεσβευτῶν, διακούσασα τῶν λόγων ὑπερέθετο τὴν ἀπόκρισιν.

In 189, when the senate was laying down the general guidelines to be pursued by Manlius and his decemvirate in Asia in 188, they directed that Lycia and Caria be given to Rhodes (Polyb. 21.24.7; Livy 37.56.5–6). When the decemvirate arrived, however, the legates were approached by an embassy from Ilion, which had come to intercede on behalf of Lycia. The Romans decided to compromise on the settling of the Lycian matter and gave a decision that turned out to be conducive to widely differing constructions. They informed the Ilian ambassadors that they would impose no punishment on the Lycians for having been in Antiochos's camp; but they also told the Rhodians that they were giving them Lycia.

Polybios says that the Romans gave Lycia to Rhodes "as a gift."[1] This, at any rate, is what the Rhodian ambassadors reported back to their state, while the Ilians, no doubt overenthusiastically, informed the Lycians that the Romans had promised them their freedom. Whether deliberately so or not, the Roman decision on the status of Lycia certainly seems to have been ambiguous. In later years, both Lycians and Rhodians were to appeal back to the original decision of the decemvirate in support of their case. In the meantime Lycia began to act on the assumption that it was independent, while Rhodes began to act on the understanding that Lycia was now its subject. When Lycian ambassadors arrived in Rhodes to ask for an alliance, the Rhodians made it clear to them that they considered Lycia to be a subject-province and would not deal with the Lycians as free equals.

The text of Polybios is lacunose at this point (22.5.10), and it is impossible to say whether the Lycian embassy appealed now to the Roman decision. What

1. ἐν δωρεᾷ. It has been suggested that Polybios's supposedly objective version of events is here influenced by a Rhodian source (Fraser/Bean, pp. 112–13; Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 3, p. 183).

they certainly did do was return to Lycia, which shortly thereafter revolted from Rhodian control. Schmitt and Berthold argue that the Rhodians were clearly given complete control of Lycia from the start. The fact that Lycia revolted rather than making an appeal to the decemvirate (as far as we know) is an argument in favour of that view. The argument is weakened, however, by the fact that the Lycians clearly *did* believe themselves to be *legally* justified.[2] Their interpretation of the "revolt" was that they were legitimately resisting armed aggression as Rhodes attempted to take control.

By 178/7, the Rhodians had effectively conquered the Lycians, but Lycia retained sufficient independence to send an embassy to Rome. This time the senate listened and decided to send a message to Rhodes, clarifying their decision of a decade earlier. They said that Lycia had been given to Rhodes *not* as a gift but assigned to their protection as a friend and ally. Livy, in keeping with the emotional tone of this passage, expands the Roman message into a grand statement of the Roman championship of liberty. But the Rhodians were unimpressed. They considered that the Romans had been fooled by the Lycian ambassadors, and furthermore that the Romans were politically motivated in refusing to support Rhodes's viewpoint. Recent Rhodian activities in partnership with Macedon and the Seleukids might have aroused Roman fears, and the Rhodians believed Rome used the Lycian affair to give them a slap on the wrist.[3] When Rhodes tried to present its view of the case, the senate deferred answering. Nevertheless, Rome characteristically took no real action in the matter, and Rhodes and Lycia went back to fighting. The real crisis in the Rhodes-Lycia dispute came a decade later, at a time when Rome was once again redefining its policy towards Rhodes. This was a time of crisis between Rome and Rhodes, when Rhodes's actions in the Third Macedonian War had offended Rome deeply. The decision of Rome to free both Lycia and Caria entirely in 167 must be linked to this.

Both Rhodes and Lycia, then, had turned to Rome to settle their dispute. Both sides had what they believed to be perfectly legitimate claims, claims that they based on the decision of the Roman decemvirate in 188. Naturally, each expected Rome to support their own argument. But the issue was clouded by the apparent ambiguity of Rome's original pronouncement. Rome felt free to

2. Berthold's argument that the Lycian appeal to the senate in 178/7 (Livy 41.6) was based on moral rather than juridical grounds arises from Livy's "subjective" source (pro-Roman and anti-Rhodian?), which was concerned to bring out the cruel suffering of the innocent Lycians, rather than any legal arguments they might have. Livy is also inaccurate (41.6.8) in ignoring the work of the decemvirate and presenting the grant of Lycia to Rhodes as a war prize given by L. Scipio. The fact that the Roman decision of 178/7, in response to this embassy, *itself* makes reference to the 188 decision shows that the Lycian ambassadors must have made an appeal to law.

3. See Berthold, pp. 174f.; Errington, *Dawn*, pp. 193–94.

interpret that pronouncement as it saw fit, being the original source of it. But Rome was clearly not a neutral mediator in 178/7. The Lycian-Rhodian affair had been neglected until it was time for Rome to communicate its displeasure to Rhodes.

103. Future boundary arbitration envisioned between Pidasa and a neighbour (?) (188/7?)

An inscription of a sympolity treaty between Miletos and its small neighbour Pidasa. White marble stele; h: 1.64 m; w: 0.685–0.745 m; d: 0.15 m. Only the relevant clauses are included here.

*Rehm, *Milet* I.3, 149.1–2, 37–39.

L. Robert, *BCH* 102 (1978) pp. 514–15; R. M. Errington, *Chiron* 19 (1989) pp. 284–88.

1 Ἀγαθῆι τύχηι. ἐπὶ στεφανηφόρου Πασικλείους μηνὸς Ἀνθεστηριῶνος
τάδε ὡμολόγησαν καὶ συνέθεντο Μιλήσιοι καὶ Πιδασεῖς, κτλ....

37 ... ἐγδικῆσαι δὲ τὸν δῆμον τὸμ Μιλησίων καὶ περὶ τῆς χώρας
τῆς ἀποκαθεσταμένης αὐτοῖς ὑπὸ τῶν στρατηγῶν, ἐάν τις γίν[η]-
ται διάκρισις.

In the early part of the second century the state of Miletos entered into a sympolity treaty with its small neighbour Pidasa.[1] The Milesians were of course the dominant partners in this new relationship, but the Pidasans might be expected to benefit in a number of ways from it, via their newly granted Milesian citizenship. The Milesians were to send a garrison to Pidasa, but the Pidasans could have welcomed such a move, since the region had suffered from fighting in the recent past, fighting that had been to the detriment of Pidasa. From the clause cited above, it appears that the Pidasans had suffered a loss of territory, territory that was subsequently restored to them, perhaps by Roman commanders in the region.[2] There is no indication of who removed the land from Pidasa. One of Pidasa and Miletos's neighbours may have been the guilty party; perhaps a territorial loss connected with military action should be related to the aftermath of the war with Antiochos. The general settlements of 188 and later

1. The date of this treaty was thought by the original editor to be early 182. But recent work on the lists of the *stephanephoroi* of Miletos by M. Wörrle (*Chiron* 18 [1988]), and new conjectures as to the date of the war between Magnesia and Miletos by Errington have produced a new possibility for the date of the Miletos-Pidasa sympolity: 188/7 B.C. Cf. **108**, **109**.

2. Robert (p. 515) argues that the στρατηγοί of line 38 cannot be Milesian generals (so Rehm) but must be Romans consuls or proconsuls.

interpret that pronouncement as it saw fit, being the original source of it. But Rome was clearly not a neutral mediator in 178/7. The Lycian-Rhodian affair had been neglected until it was time for Rome to communicate its displeasure to Rhodes.

103. Future boundary arbitration envisioned between Pidasa and a neighbour (?) (188/7?)

An inscription of a sympolity treaty between Miletos and its small neighbour Pidasa. White marble stele; h: 1.64 m; w: 0.685–0.745 m; d: 0.15 m. Only the relevant clauses are included here.

*Rehm, *Milet* I.3, 149.1–2, 37–39.

L. Robert, *BCH* 102 (1978) pp. 514–15; R. M. Errington, *Chiron* 19 (1989) pp. 284–88.

1 Ἀγαθῆι τύχηι. ἐπὶ στεφανηφόρου Πασικλείους μηνὸς Ἀνθεστηριῶνος
τάδε ὡμολόγησαν καὶ συνέθεντο Μιλήσιοι καὶ Πιδασεῖς, κτλ....

37 ... ἐγδικῆσαι δὲ τὸν δῆμον τὸμ Μιλησίων καὶ περὶ τῆς χώρας
τῆς ἀποκαθεσταμένης αὐτοῖς ὑπὸ τῶν στρατηγῶν, ἐάν τις γίν[η]-
ται διάκρισις.

In the early part of the second century the state of Miletos entered into a sympolity treaty with its small neighbour Pidasa.[1] The Milesians were of course the dominant partners in this new relationship, but the Pidasans might be expected to benefit in a number of ways from it, via their newly granted Milesian citizenship. The Milesians were to send a garrison to Pidasa, but the Pidasans could have welcomed such a move, since the region had suffered from fighting in the recent past, fighting that had been to the detriment of Pidasa. From the clause cited above, it appears that the Pidasans had suffered a loss of territory, territory that was subsequently restored to them, perhaps by Roman commanders in the region.[2] There is no indication of who removed the land from Pidasa. One of Pidasa and Miletos's neighbours may have been the guilty party; perhaps a territorial loss connected with military action should be related to the aftermath of the war with Antiochos. The general settlements of 188 and later

1. The date of this treaty was thought by the original editor to be early 182. But recent work on the lists of the *stephanephoroi* of Miletos by M. Wörrle (*Chiron* 18 [1988]), and new conjectures as to the date of the war between Magnesia and Miletos by Errington have produced a new possibility for the date of the Miletos-Pidasa sympolity: 188/7 B.C. Cf. **108**, **109**.

2. Robert (p. 515) argues that the στρατηγοί of line 38 cannot be Milesian generals (so Rehm) but must be Romans consuls or proconsuls.

no doubt resulted in a variety of rivalries in this region.[3] A possibility remained that future claims would be laid to the territory, presumably by the party who had taken it from Pidasa and then subsequently lost it. If a future judicial dispute were to occur over the land, then Miletos agreed to act as Pidasa's advocate, bringing its own greater influence to bear in supporting Pidasa's position.

104. L. Scipio attempts mediation between Antiochos III and Eumenes II (?) (187)

I: Livy 38.39.17.
II: Livy 39.22.8–9.
III: Polybios 21.46.11.

De Ruggiero, pp. 40, 65, 142, 155, 161–63, 238–40; Phillipson, pp. 154–55; A. H. McDonald, *JRS* 57 (1967) pp. 1–8; Hansen[2], p. 96; Klose, p. 144; Will, vol.2, pp. 228–29; Gruen, pp. 105–6; Eckstein, *Historia* 37 (1988) p. 417.

I: Livy 38.39.17

De Pamphylia disceptatum inter Eumenem et Antiochi legatos cum esset, quia pars eius citra pars ultra Taurum est, integra res ad senatum reicitur.

II: Livy 39.22.8–9

L. Scipio ludos eo tempore, quos bello Antiochi vovisse sese dicebat, ex collata ad id pecunia ab regibus civitatibusque per dies decem fecit. (9) legatum eum post damnationem et bona vendita missum in Asiam ad dirimenda inter Antiochum et Eumenem reges certamina Valerius Antias est auctor.

III: Polybios 21.46.11

Περὶ δὲ τῆς Παμφυλίας, Εὐμένους μὲν εἶναι φάσκοντος αὐτὴν ἐπὶ τάδε τοῦ Ταύρου, τῶν ⟨δὲ⟩ παρ' Ἀντιόχου πρεσβευτῶν ἐπέκεινα, διαπορήσαντες ἀνέθεντο περὶ τούτων εἰς τὴν σύγκλητον.

Livy reports that the historian Valerius Antias recorded a mediation performed by L. Scipio between the two Asian kings Antiochos and Eumenes. The information given is exceedingly scanty, and perhaps untrustworthy.[1] No details are given with respect to the subject of the dispute or the nature of the arbitration, but de Ruggiero connected this brief notice in Livy to other evidence

3. Cf. **98**, **100**, **108**, **109**.
1. See Gruen, p. 105.

no doubt resulted in a variety of rivalries in this region.[3] A possibility remained that future claims would be laid to the territory, presumably by the party who had taken it from Pidasa and then subsequently lost it. If a future judicial dispute were to occur over the land, then Miletos agreed to act as Pidasa's advocate, bringing its own greater influence to bear in supporting Pidasa's position.

104. L. Scipio attempts mediation between Antiochos III and Eumenes II (?) (187)

I: Livy 38.39.17.
II: Livy 39.22.8–9.
III: Polybios 21.46.11.

De Ruggiero, pp. 40, 65, 142, 155, 161–63, 238–40; Phillipson, pp. 154–55; A. H. McDonald, *JRS* 57 (1967) pp. 1–8; Hansen[2], p. 96; Klose, p. 144; Will, vol.2, pp. 228–29; Gruen, pp. 105–6; Eckstein, *Historia* 37 (1988) p. 417.

I: Livy 38.39.17

De Pamphylia disceptatum inter Eumenem et Antiochi legatos cum esset, quia pars eius citra pars ultra Taurum est, integra res ad senatum reicitur.

II: Livy 39.22.8–9

L. Scipio ludos eo tempore, quos bello Antiochi vovisse sese dicebat, ex collata ad id pecunia ab regibus civitatibusque per dies decem fecit. (9) legatum eum post damnationem et bona vendita missum in Asiam ad dirimenda inter Antiochum et Eumenem reges certamina Valerius Antias est auctor.

III: Polybios 21.46.11

Περὶ δὲ τῆς Παμφυλίας, Εὐμένους μὲν εἶναι φάσκοντος αὐτὴν ἐπὶ τάδε τοῦ Ταύρου, τῶν ⟨δὲ⟩ παρ' Ἀντιόχου πρεσβευτῶν ἐπέκεινα, διαπορήσαντες ἀνέθεντο περὶ τούτων εἰς τὴν σύγκλητον.

Livy reports that the historian Valerius Antias recorded a mediation performed by L. Scipio between the two Asian kings Antiochos and Eumenes. The information given is exceedingly scanty, and perhaps untrustworthy.[1] No details are given with respect to the subject of the dispute or the nature of the arbitration, but de Ruggiero connected this brief notice in Livy to other evidence

3. Cf. **98**, **100**, **108**, **109**.
1. See Gruen, p. 105.

pertaining to a dispute between Antiochos and Eumenes, that which took place over Pamphylia.[2] Following the settlement at Apameia, a disagreement arose over whether the Asia Minor region of Pamphylia should be regarded as subject to Antiochos or Eumenes. Naturally it was claimed by both sides, and the dispute was submitted to Rome for arbitration, perhaps in accordance with the arbitration clause in the Peace of Apameia (**97**). The senate may then have given L. Scipio special powers to settle the matter between Antiochos and Eumenes. Livy states that Scipio's settlement of the question took place after his trial in 187. While possible, this gives us a fairly restricted time limit, as Antiochos died in 187. In any case, the Roman arbitration over the possession of Pamphylia, whether it is to be connected to L. Scipio or not, had apparently little lasting result. Less than twenty years later Pamphylia was an independent state.[3]

105. Megara mediates between Boiotia and the Achaian League (187/6)

Polybios 22.4.9–17.

B. Haussoullier, *Traité entre Delphes et Pellana* (Paris, 1917) pp. 105–9; Larsen (Frank), p. 287; Gruen, p. 109.

'Εν δὲ τοῖς καιροῖς τούτοις πρεσβεύσαντος αὐτοῦ τοῦ Ζευξίππου πρὸς τὴν σύγκλητον, οἱ 'Ρωμαῖοι τὴν τῶν Βοιωτῶν προαίρεσιν ἔγραψαν πρός τε τοὺς Αἰτωλοὺς καὶ πρὸς 'Αχαιούς, κελεύοντες κατάγειν Ζεύξιππον εἰς τὴν οἰκείαν. (10) οἱ δ' 'Αχαιοὶ τοῦ μὲν ⟨διὰ⟩ στρατοπέδων ποιεῖσθαι τὴν ἔφοδον ἀπέσχον, πρεσβευτὰς δὲ προεχειρίσαντο πέμπειν τοὺς παρακαλέσοντας τοὺς Βοιωτοὺς τοῖς λεγομένοις ὑπὸ τῶν 'Ρωμαίων πειθαρχεῖν καὶ τὴν δικαιοδοσίαν, καθάπερ καὶ τὴν ἐν αὐτοῖς, οὕτω καὶ τὴν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ τέλος ἀγαγεῖν. (11) συνέβαινε γὰρ καὶ τὰ πρὸς τούτους συναλλάγματα παρέλκεσθαι πολὺν ἤδη χρόνον. (12) ὧν διακούσαντες οἱ Βοιωτοί, στρατηγοῦντος 'Ιππίου παρ' αὐτοῖς, παραχρῆμα μὲν ὑπέσχοντο ποιήσειν τὰ παρακαλούμενα, μετ' ὀλίγον δὲ πάντων ὠλιγώρησαν. (13) διόπερ ὁ Φιλοποίμην, 'Ιππίου μὲν ἀποτεθειμένου τὴν ἀρχήν, 'Αλκέτου δὲ παρειληφότος, ἀπέδωκε τοῖς αἰτουμένοις τὰ ῥύσια κατὰ τῶν Βοιωτῶν. (14) ἐξ ὧν ἐγίνετο καταρχὴ διαφορᾶς τοῖς ἔθνεσιν οὐκ εὐκαταφρόνητος. (15) παραυτίκα γὰρ ἔλαχε ... τῶν Μυρρίχου θρεμμάτων καὶ τοῦ Σίμωνος· καὶ περὶ ταῦτα γενομένης συμπλοκῆς, οὐκέτι πολιτικῆς διαφορᾶς, ἀλλὰ πολεμικῆς ἔχθρας ἐγένετο καταρχὴ καὶ προοίμιον. (16) εἰ μὲν οὖν ⟨ἡ⟩ σύγκλητος προσέθηκε τὰκόλουθον περὶ τῆς καθόδου τῶν περὶ τὸν Ζεύξιππον, ταχέως ἂν ἐξεκαύθη πόλεμος· (17) νῦν δ' ἐκείνη τε παρεσιώπησεν, οἵ τε Μεγαρεῖς ἐπέσχον τὰ ῥύσια, διαπρεσβευσαμένων ... τοῖς συναλλάγμασιν.

2. De Ruggiero; cf. also Phillipson, Klose, Hansen[2].
3. In 169 an independent Pamphylia was sending embassies to Rome (Livy 44.14).

pertaining to a dispute between Antiochos and Eumenes, that which took place over Pamphylia.[2] Following the settlement at Apameia, a disagreement arose over whether the Asia Minor region of Pamphylia should be regarded as subject to Antiochos or Eumenes. Naturally it was claimed by both sides, and the dispute was submitted to Rome for arbitration, perhaps in accordance with the arbitration clause in the Peace of Apameia (**97**). The senate may then have given L. Scipio special powers to settle the matter between Antiochos and Eumenes. Livy states that Scipio's settlement of the question took place after his trial in 187. While possible, this gives us a fairly restricted time limit, as Antiochos died in 187. In any case, the Roman arbitration over the possession of Pamphylia, whether it is to be connected to L. Scipio or not, had apparently little lasting result. Less than twenty years later Pamphylia was an independent state.[3]

105. Megara mediates between Boiotia and the Achaian League (187/6)

Polybios 22.4.9–17.

B. Haussoullier, *Traité entre Delphes et Pellana* (Paris, 1917) pp. 105–9; Larsen (Frank), p. 287; Gruen, p. 109.

'Εν δὲ τοῖς καιροῖς τούτοις πρεσβεύσαντος αὐτοῦ τοῦ Ζευξίππου πρὸς τὴν σύγκλητον, οἱ 'Ρωμαῖοι τὴν τῶν Βοιωτῶν προαίρεσιν ἔγραψαν πρός τε τοὺς Αἰτωλοὺς καὶ πρὸς 'Αχαιούς, κελεύοντες κατάγειν Ζεύξιππον εἰς τὴν οἰκείαν. (10) οἱ δ' 'Αχαιοὶ τοῦ μὲν ⟨διὰ⟩ στρατοπέδων ποιεῖσθαι τὴν ἔφοδον ἀπέσχον, πρεσβευτὰς δὲ προεχειρίσαντο πέμπειν τοὺς παρακαλέσοντας τοὺς Βοιωτοὺς τοῖς λεγομένοις ὑπὸ τῶν 'Ρωμαίων πειθαρχεῖν καὶ τὴν δικαιοδοσίαν, καθάπερ καὶ τὴν ἐν αὐτοῖς, οὕτω καὶ τὴν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ τέλος ἀγαγεῖν. (11) συνέβαινε γὰρ καὶ τὰ πρὸς τούτους συναλλάγματα παρέλκεσθαι πολὺν ἤδη χρόνον. (12) ὧν διακούσαντες οἱ Βοιωτοί, στρατηγοῦντος 'Ιππίου παρ' αὐτοῖς, παραχρῆμα μὲν ὑπέσχοντο ποιήσειν τὰ παρακαλούμενα, μετ' ὀλίγον δὲ πάντων ὠλιγώρησαν. (13) διόπερ ὁ Φιλοποίμην, 'Ιππίου μὲν ἀποτεθειμένου τὴν ἀρχήν, 'Αλκέτου δὲ παρειληφότος, ἀπέδωκε τοῖς αἰτουμένοις τὰ ῥύσια κατὰ τῶν Βοιωτῶν. (14) ἐξ ὧν ἐγίνετο καταρχὴ διαφορᾶς τοῖς ἔθνεσιν οὐκ εὐκαταφρόνητος. (15) παραυτίκα γὰρ ἔλαχε ... τῶν Μυρρίχου θρεμμάτων καὶ τοῦ Σίμωνος· καὶ περὶ ταῦτα γενομένης συμπλοκῆς, οὐκέτι πολιτικῆς διαφορᾶς, ἀλλὰ πολεμικῆς ἔχθρας ἐγένετο καταρχὴ καὶ προοίμιον. (16) εἰ μὲν οὖν ⟨ἡ⟩ σύγκλητος προσέθηκε τὰκόλουθον περὶ τῆς καθόδου τῶν περὶ τὸν Ζεύξιππον, ταχέως ἂν ἐξεκαύθη πόλεμος· (17) νῦν δ' ἐκείνη τε παρεσιώπησεν, οἵ τε Μεγαρεῖς ἐπέσχον τὰ ῥύσια, διαπρεσβευσαμένων ... τοῖς συναλλάγμασιν.

2. De Ruggiero; cf. also Phillipson, Klose, Hansen[2].
3. In 169 an independent Pamphylia was sending embassies to Rome (Livy 44.14).

The antecedents to the quarrel between Achaia and Boiotia, a quarrel settled by the mediation of Megara, were to be found in a lengthy history of unsettled private disputes between Achaian and Boiotian citizens, and in the political interests of Rome. The Romans had turned to the Achaian League, pressing them to use their influence with the Boiotians to recall their pro-Roman statesman Zeuxippos. The Achaians thereupon sent envoys to the Boiotians with a double request: they asked the Boiotians on behalf of the Romans to restore Zeuxippos; and on their own behalf they requested the Boiotians to settle the long outstanding disputes between private Boiotian and Achaian citizens.[1] The Boiotians failed to respond vigorously to either of these requests, and the Achaians, under the less-than-tactful Philopoimen, retaliated by granting the right of reprisal to any Achaians concerned in the private suits.[2] It was this action on the part of the Achaian League that led to the hostility between Achaian and Boiotian citizens taking on national proportions. In order to avert a war, the Megarians intervened between the two federations and put a stop to the reprisals and perhaps also helped to bring about an agreement with respect to the outstanding suits.[3] Strictly speaking, Megara at this point was again part of the Achaian League; however, as recently as 192 it had been part of the Boiotian League and evidently in some respects still occupied a kind of middle ground with respect to Achaia and Boiotia.

106. Various states complain of Philip V to Rome (186/5 and later)

I: Polybios 22.6.
II: Livy 39.24.13–25.7.
III: Livy 39.25.16–26.4.
IV: Livy 39.26.14.
V: Livy 39.29.1–2.
VI: Pausanias 7.8.6.

1. Polybios (20.6) also records a general state of unsettled litigation within Boiotia itself, circumstances that had directly contributed to Megara's departure from the League a few years previously.

2. On ῥύσια cf. **138**.

3. Unfortunately, the text of Polybios has a lacuna at this point (22.4.17). "Schweighaeuser suggested διαπρεσβευσάμενοι ⟨πρὸς ἀμφοτέρους, καὶ τῶν Βοιωτῶν τὸ ἱκανὸν πεποιημένων⟩ τοῖς συναλλάγμασιν; but perhaps it was only the Boeotians who sent envoys and asked for Megarian intervention (offering to resolve the judicial impasse)" (Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 3, p. 181). There is some epigraphic evidence that Megara may have been involved at this time in settling suits within the Boiotian cities; an inscription discovered in Megara (*IG* VII.21) records the sending of judges from Megara to Orchomenos.

The antecedents to the quarrel between Achaia and Boiotia, a quarrel settled by the mediation of Megara, were to be found in a lengthy history of unsettled private disputes between Achaian and Boiotian citizens, and in the political interests of Rome. The Romans had turned to the Achaian League, pressing them to use their influence with the Boiotians to recall their pro-Roman statesman Zeuxippos. The Achaians thereupon sent envoys to the Boiotians with a double request: they asked the Boiotians on behalf of the Romans to restore Zeuxippos; and on their own behalf they requested the Boiotians to settle the long outstanding disputes between private Boiotian and Achaian citizens.[1] The Boiotians failed to respond vigorously to either of these requests, and the Achaians, under the less-than-tactful Philopoimen, retaliated by granting the right of reprisal to any Achaians concerned in the private suits.[2] It was this action on the part of the Achaian League that led to the hostility between Achaian and Boiotian citizens taking on national proportions. In order to avert a war, the Megarians intervened between the two federations and put a stop to the reprisals and perhaps also helped to bring about an agreement with respect to the outstanding suits.[3] Strictly speaking, Megara at this point was again part of the Achaian League; however, as recently as 192 it had been part of the Boiotian League and evidently in some respects still occupied a kind of middle ground with respect to Achaia and Boiotia.

106. Various states complain of Philip V to Rome (186/5 and later)

I: Polybios 22.6.
II: Livy 39.24.13–25.7.
III: Livy 39.25.16–26.4.
IV: Livy 39.26.14.
V: Livy 39.29.1–2.
VI: Pausanias 7.8.6.

1. Polybios (20.6) also records a general state of unsettled litigation within Boiotia itself, circumstances that had directly contributed to Megara's departure from the League a few years previously.

2. On ῥύσια cf. **138**.

3. Unfortunately, the text of Polybios has a lacuna at this point (22.4.17). "Schweighaeuser suggested διαπρεσβευσάμενοι ⟨πρὸς ἀμφοτέρους, καὶ τῶν Βοιωτῶν τὸ ἱκανὸν πεποιημένων⟩ τοῖς συναλλάγμασιν; but perhaps it was only the Boeotians who sent envoys and asked for Megarian intervention (offering to resolve the judicial impasse)" (Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 3, p. 181). There is some epigraphic evidence that Megara may have been involved at this time in settling suits within the Boiotian cities; an inscription discovered in Megara (*IG* VII.21) records the sending of judges from Megara to Orchomenos.

VII: Polybios 22.11.1–4.
VIII: Livy 39.33.1–4.
IX: Polybios 23.1.1–5.
X: Polybios 23.1.10–13.
XI: Livy 39.46.6–9.
XII: Appian *Macedonica* 9.6–7.

Cf. Diodoros 29.16; Polybios 23.8–9.

Walbank, *Philip V*, pp. 223–45; Badian, *FC*, pp. 92f.; Larsen (Frank), pp. 288–89; McShane, pp. 157f.; Errington, *Dawn*, pp. 195–201; Gauthier, pp. 94–100, 340–42; E. S. Gruen, *GRBS* 15 (1974) pp. 225f.; Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 3, pp. 184–86, 195, 214–16; Will, vol. 2, pp. 250–52; Gruen, pp. 105, 125, 399–402; Hammond/Walbank, *Macedonia*, vol. 3, pp. 455f.

I: Polybios 22.6

Ὅτι κατὰ τοὺς αὐτοὺς καιροὺς ἦκον εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην παρά τε τοῦ βασιλέως Εὐμένους πρεσβευταὶ διασαφοῦντες τὸν ἐξιδιασμὸν τοῦ Φιλίππου τῶν ἐπὶ Θρᾴκης πόλεων, (2) καὶ παρὰ Μαρωνειτῶν οἱ φυγάδες κατηγοροῦντες καὶ τὴν αἰτίαν ἀναφέροντες τῆς αὐτῶν ἐκπτώσεως ἐπὶ τὸν Φίλιππον, (3) ἅμα δὲ τούτοις Ἀθαμᾶνες, Περραιβοί, Θετταλοί, φάσκοντες κομίζεσθαι δεῖν αὐτοὺς τὰς πόλεις, ἃς παρείλετο Φίλιππος αὐτῶν κατὰ τὸν Ἀντιοχικὸν πόλεμον. (4) ἦκον δὲ καὶ παρὰ τοῦ Φιλίππου πρέσβεις πρὸς ἅπαντας τοὺς κατηγορήσαντας ἀπολογησόμενοι. (5) γενομένων δὲ πλειόνων λόγων πᾶσι τοῖς προειρημένοις πρὸς τοὺς παρὰ τοῦ Φιλίππου πρεσβευτάς, ἔδοξε τῇ συγκλήτῳ παραυτίκα καταστῆσαι πρεσβείαν τὴν ἐπισκεψομένην τὰ κατὰ τὸν Φίλιππον καὶ παρέξουσαν ἀσφάλειαν τοῖς βουλομένοις κατὰ πρόσωπον λέγειν τὸ φαινομένον καὶ κατηγορεῖν τοῦ βασιλέως. (6) καὶ κατεστάθησαν οἱ περὶ τὸν Κόιντον Καικίλιον καὶ Μάρκον Βαίβιον καὶ Τεβέριον Κλαύδιον.

II: Livy 39.24.13–25.7

Senatus, ne quid absente rege statueret, legatos ad eas controversias disceptandas misit Q. Caecilium Metellum M. Baebium Tamphilum Ti. Sempronium. (14) quorum sub adventum ad Thessalica Tempe omnibus iis civitatibus, quibus cum rege disceptatio erat, concilium indictum est. [**25**] ibi cum Romani legati disceptatorum loco, Thessali Perrhaebique et Athamanes haud dubii accusatores, Philippus ad audienda crimina tamquam reus consedissent, (2) pro ingenio quisque eorum, qui principes legationum erant, et gratia cum Philippo aut odio acerbius leniusve egerunt. (3) in controversiam autem veniebant Philippopolis Tricca Phaloria et Eurymenae et cetera circa eas oppida, (4) utrum, Thessalorum iuris cum essent, vi ademptae possessaeque ab Aetolis forent—nam Philippum Aetolis ademisse eas constabat—an Aetolica antiquitus ea oppida fuissent: (5) ita enim Acilium regi concessisse, si Aetolorum fuissent, et si voluntate, non si vi atque armis coacti cum Aetolis essent. (6) eiusdem formulae disceptatio de Perrhaeborum Magnetumque oppidis fuit: omnium enim iura possidendo per occasiones Aetoli miscuerant.

(7) ad haec quae disceptationis erant, querellae Thessalorum adiectae, quod ea oppida, si iam redderentur sibi, spoliata ac deserta redditurus esset.

III: Livy 39.25.16–26.4

Thessalis auditis Perrhaebi Gonnocondylum, quod Philippus Olympiadem appellaverat, Perrhaebiae fuisse, et ut sibi restitueretur, agebant; et de Malloea et Ericinio eadem postulatio erat. (17) Athamanes libertatem repetebant et castella Athenaeum et Poetneum. [**26**] Philippus, ut accusatoris potius quam rei speciem haberet, et ipse a querellis orsus Menelaidem in Dolopia, quae regni sui fuisset, Thessalos vi atque armis expugnasse questus est; item Petram in Pieria ab iisdem Thessalis Perrhaebisque captam. (2) Xynias quidem, haud dubie Aetolicum oppidum, sibi contribuisse eos; et Paracheloida, quae sub Athamania esset, nullo iure Thessalorum formulae factam. (3) nam quae sibi crimina obiciantur de insidiis legatorum et maritimis portubus frequentatis aut desertis, (4) alterum ridiculum esse, se reddere rationem, quos portus mercatores aut nautici petant, alterum mores respuere suos.

IV: Livy 39.26.14

Causa cognita pronuntiarunt legati placere deduci praesidia Macedonum ex iis urbibus, et antiquis Macedoniae terminis regnum finiri. de iniuriis quas ultro citroque illatas querantur quo modo inter eas gentes et Macedonas disceptetur, formulam iuris exsequendi constituendam esse.

V: Livy 39.29.1–2

Movit aliquantum oratio regis legatos. itaque medio responso rem suspenderunt: si decem legatorum decreto Eumeni datae civitates eae essent, nihil se mutare; (2) si Philippus bello cepisset eas, praemium victoriae iure belli habiturum; si neutrum eorum foret, cognitionem placere senatui reservari et, ut omnia in integro manerent, praesidia quae in iis urbibus sint deduci.

VI: Pausanias 7.8.6

Λακεδαιμόνιοι δὲ ἅτε μεγάλως τοῖς ἐπιτάγμασιν ἀχθόμενοι τοῖς Ἀχαιῶν καταφεύγουσιν ἐπὶ Μέτελλον καὶ ὅσοι σὺν Μετέλλῳ κατὰ πρεσβείαν ἦκον ἐκ Ῥώμης. ἀφίκοντο δὲ οὗτοι Φιλίππῳ καὶ Μακεδόσι πόλεμον μὲν οὐδένα ἐπάξοντες ἅτε εἰρήνης πρότερον ἔτι Φιλίππῳ καὶ Ῥωμαίοις ὁμωμοσμένης, ὁπόσα δὲ ἢ Θεσσαλοῖς ἢ τῶν ἐξ Ἠπείρου τισὶν ἐγκλήματα ἦν ἐς Φίλιππον, ταῦτα ἦκον οἱ ὁμοῦ Μετέλλῳ κρινοῦντες.

VII: Polybios 22.11.1–4

Ὅτι τῶν περὶ τὸν Καικίλιον ἀνακεχωρηκότων ἐκ τῆς Ἑλλάδος καὶ διαπεσαφηκότων τῇ συγκλήτῳ περί τε τῶν κατὰ Μακεδονίαν καὶ τῶν κατὰ Πελοπόννησον, εἰσῆγον εἰς τὴν σύγκλητον τοὺς περὶ τούτων (παρα)γεγονότας

πρεσβευτάς. (2) εἰσελθόντων δὲ πρῶτον τῶν παρὰ τοῦ Φιλίππου καὶ παρ' Εὐμένους, ἔτι δὲ τῶν ἐξ Αἴνου καὶ Μαρωνείας φυγάδων, καὶ ποιησαμένων τοὺς λόγους ἀκολούθως τοῖς ἐν Θετταλονίκῃ ῥηθεῖσιν ἐπὶ τῶν περὶ τὸν Καικίλιον, (3) ἔδοξε τῇ συγκλήτῳ πέμπειν πάλιν ἄλλους πρεσβευτὰς πρὸς τὸν Φίλιππον τοὺς ἐπισκεψομένους πρῶτον μὲν εἰ παρακεχώρηκε τῶν ἐν ⟨Θετταλίᾳ καὶ⟩ Περραιβίᾳ πόλεων κατὰ τὴν τῶν περὶ τὸν Καικίλιον ἀπόκρισιν, (4) εἶτα τοὺς ἐπιτάξοντας αὐτῷ τὰς φρουρὰς ἐξάγειν ἐξ Αἴνου καὶ Μαρωνείας, καὶ συλλήβδην ἀποβαίνειν ἀπὸ τῶν παραθαλαττίων τῆς Θρᾴκης ἐρυμάτων καὶ τόπων καὶ πόλεων.

VIII: Livy 39.33.1–4

Principio insequentis anni P. Claudius L. Porcius consules, cum Q. Caecilius M. Baebius Ti. Sempronius, qui ad disceptandum inter Philippum et Eumenem reges Thessalorumque civitates missi erant, legationem renuntiassent, (2) regum quoque eorum civitatiumque legatos in senatum introduxerunt. (3) eadem utrimque iterata, quae dicta apud legatos in Graecia erant. aliam deinde novam legationem patres, cuius princeps Ap. Claudius fuit, in Graeciam et Macedoniam decreverunt ad visendum, redditaene civitates Thessalis et Perrhaebis essent. (4) iisdem mandatum, ut ab Aeno et Maronea praesidia deducerentur, maritimaque omnis Thraciae ora a Philippo et Macedonibus liberaretur.

IX: Polybios 23.1.1–5

Ὅτι κατὰ τὴν ἑνάτην καὶ τετταρακοστὴν ὀλυμπιάδα πρὸς ταῖς ἑκατὸν εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην ἠθροίσθησαν πρεσβειῶν πλῆθος ἀπὸ τῆς Ἑλλάδος, ὅσον οὐ ταχέως πρότερον. (2) τοῦ γὰρ Φιλίππου συγκλεισθέντος εἰς τὴν κατὰ τὸ σύμβολον δικαιοδοσίαν πρὸς τοὺς ἀστυγείτονας, καὶ τῶν Ῥωμαίων γνωσθέντων ὅτι πρασδέχονται τὰς κατὰ Φιλίππου κατηγορίας καὶ πρόνοιαν ποιοῦνται τῆς ἀσφαλείας ⟨τῶν⟩ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀμφισβητούντων, (3) ἅπαντες οἱ παρακείμενοι τῇ Μακεδονίᾳ παρῆσαν, οἱ μὲν κατ' ἰδίαν, οἱ δὲ κατὰ πόλιν, οἱ δὲ κατὰ τὰς ἐθνικὰς συστάσεις, ἐγκαλοῦντες τῷ Φιλίππῳ. (4) σὺν δὲ τούτοις οἱ παρ' Εὐμένους ἦκον ἅμ' Ἀθηναίῳ τῷ τοῦ βασιλέως ἀδελφῷ, κατηγορήσοντες αὐτοῦ περί τε τῶν ἐπὶ Θρᾴκης πόλεων καὶ περὶ τῆς ἀποσταλείσης Προυσίᾳ βοηθείας. (5) ἦκε δὲ καὶ Δημήτριος ὁ τοῦ Φιλίππου πρὸς πάντας τούτους ἀπολογησόμενος, ἔχων Ἀπελλῆν καὶ Φιλοκλῆ μεθ' αὐτοῦ, τοὺς τότε δοκοῦντας εἶναι πρώτους φίλους τοῦ βασιλέως.

X: Polybios 23.1.10–13

Παρά τε γὰρ Θετταλῶν καὶ κατὰ κοινὸν ἦκον καὶ κατ' ἰδίαν ἀφ' ἑκάστης πόλεως πρεσβευταί, παρά τε Περραιβῶν, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ παρ' Ἀθαμάνων καὶ παρ' Ἠπειρωτῶν καὶ παρ' Ἰλλυριῶν· (11) ⟨ὧν⟩ οἱ μὲν περὶ χώρας, οἱ δὲ περὶ σωμάτων, οἱ δὲ περὶ θρεμμάτων ἦκον ἀμφισβητοῦντες, ἔνιοι δὲ περὶ συμβολαίων καὶ τῶν εἰς αὐτοὺς ἀδικημάτων, (12) τινὲς μὲν οὐ φάσκοντες δύνασθαι τυχεῖν τοῦ δικαίου κατὰ τὸ σύμβολον διὰ τὸ τὸν Φίλιππον ἐκκόπτειν

τὴν δικαιοδοσίαν, τινὲς δ' ἐγκαλοῦντες τοῖς κρίμασιν ὡς παραβεβραβευμένοι, διαφθείραντος τοῦ Φιλίππου τοὺς δικαστάς. (13) καθόλου δὲ ποικίλη τις ἦν ἀκρισία καὶ δυσχώρητος ἐκ τῶν κατηγορουμένων.

XI: Livy 39.46.6–9

Nec umquam ante tantum regionis eius hominum Romae fuerat. (7) nam ex quo fama per gentes, quae Macedoniam accolunt, vulgata est crimina querimoniasque de Philippo non neglegenter ab Romanis audiri, (8) multis operae pretium fuisse queri, pro se quaeque civitates gentesque, singuli etiam privatim—gravis enim accola omnibus erat—Romam aut ad spem levandae iniuriae aut ad deflendae solacium venerunt. (9) et ab Eumene rege legatio cum fratre eius Athenaeo venit ad querendum simul quod non deducerentur ex Thracia praesidia, simul quod in Bithyniam Prusiae bellum adversus Eumenem gerenti auxilia missa forent.

XII: Appian "Macedonica" 9.6–7

Ἐκτελεσθέντος δὲ τοῦ κατ' Ἀντιόχου πολέμου πολλοὶ κατηγόρουν τοῦ Φιλίππου, τὰ μὲν ἀδικεῖν αὐτὸν, τὰ δὲ οὐ ποιεῖν ὧν ὥρισε Φλαμινῖνος, ὅτε διετίθετο τὴν Ἑλλάδα. καὶ Δημήτριος ἐς ἀντιλογίαν ἐπρέσβευεν ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ, κεχαρισμένος μὲν ἔκπαλαι Ῥωμαίοις ἀπὸ τῆς ὁμηρείας, Φλαμινίνου δὲ αὐτὸν τῇ βουλῇ γνωρίζοντος ἰσχυρῶς. νεώτερον δ' ὄντα καὶ θορυβούμενον ἐκέλευσαν τὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑπομνήματα ἀναγνῶναι, ἐν οἷς ἦν ἐφ' ἑκάστου, τὰ μὲν ἤδη γεγονέναι, τὰ δὲ γενήσεσθαι, καίπερ ἀδίκως ὡρισμένα· καὶ γὰρ τοῦτο προσέκειτο πολλοῖς. ἡ δὲ βουλὴ τὴν ὑπόγυον αὐτοῦ ἐς Ἀντίοχον προθυμίαν αἰδουμένη, συγγιγνώσκειν τε ἔφη, καὶ προσεπεῖπε διὰ Δημήτριον.... ὡς δὲ καὶ ἐν δίκῃ τινὶ Ῥωμαῖοι πολλὰ τῶν Φιλίππου πρὸς Εὐμένη μετέφερον, ἀσθενοποιοῦντες ἀεὶ τὸν Φίλιππον, ἐς πόλεμον ἤδη λανθάνων ἡτοιμάζετο.

The settlement at the end of the Second Macedonian War had reflected the Roman desire to maintain a balance between an independent and pro-Roman Greece and a Macedon strong enough to offset Aitolia and Antiochos. The position of Rome as "guarantor" of that settlement meant that it became the focus of various appeals to adjudicate when that equilibrium was disturbed. The wealth of appeals to Rome when disputes erupted between Philip and various other states was a recognition of Rome's power and its claim to ensure the "freedom of the Greeks." But it also emanated from a recollection of erstwhile Roman hostility to Philip and a general sense that Rome would be bound to protect the interests of anyone ill disposed to the Macedonian king. There are also indications that the terms of the peace treaty of 196 included an arbitration clause similar to that found in the peace treaty of Apameia eight years later (**99**). It seems unlikely that Rome foresaw arbitrating all these disputes itself; probably it intended that the Greeks make use of what was, after all, a Greek institution.[1]

1. See Gruen, p. 105.

But problems arose with the Greek tribunals. It is nowhere stated explicitly, but probably the greatest problem of all was that of insufficient prestige on the part of these tribunals. Rome, on the other hand, never suffered from a lack of prestige, and it never hurt for complainants to go directly to the top. Therefore, disputes that Rome may have realized would take place, but that it never contemplated having to deal with itself, came to be arbitrated by Roman commissions and senatorial hearings.

There were various accusations made against Philip in the 180s. Most of them sprang from his attempts to reconstruct Macedon, a fact that in itself might have made the Romans nervous and quite willing to listen to Philip's enemies. Philip appears to have attempted to avoid Roman hostility or interference by keeping to the letter of his agreements, but it was not long before complaints from other states invited the intervention of the Romans. His seizure of the towns of Ainos and Maroneia offended Eumenes as much as the inhabitants of the towns themselves, and in 186/5, Eumenes' ambassadors accompanied the exiles of Maroneia to Rome in order to air their grievance. At the same time embassies also arrived in Rome to request the senate to rule on the matter of territories Philip had appropriated in Thessaly and elsewhere in the course of the war against the Aitolians.

The Romans were not especially concerned about the plight of the Thessalians, perhaps reasonably enough. Philip had the perfectly legitimate excuse that he had taken the towns from Aitolian control, and his actions had been sanctioned by the Roman general at the time. Philip's envoys pointed this out when they argued his case (Livy 39.24.10–12). The senate was, however, alarmed by Philip's aggression against Ainos and Maroneia and decided to investigate, following a typical policy of deferring a decision until it could send out a group of legates to report. A commission of three was empanelled, including Q. Caecilius Metellus, whose instructions were to go to Greece and hear the arguments of both Philip and his opponents. In other words the commission had all the appearance of a court of law. As Livy makes clear, the legates who convened at Tempe in the spring of 185 were to sit in judgement on Philip and his accusers (39.25.1–2).

It was the judicial character of this tribunal that was so offensive to Philip. Although it could be argued that the Romans came to arbitrate in a neutral fashion, as was appropriate between sovereign states, the real tenor of the situation (or at least Philip's perception of it) was quite different. The Romans came to hear not conflicting claims of equivalent worth but rather an accusation and a defense. Philip was the prisoner, hauled up to hear criminal charges against him, or so he felt and so the sources reflect. As when the Romans had called for him to submit to arbitration in 200 (**59**), the real judgements had already been made. Philip was aware that the impartiality of the Roman judges was only a stance; the Romans would, as always, make their judgement based on political considerations. If it required them to "reinterpret" one of their own

earlier contracts, that would present no problem. Philip allowed the Romans to see that he really did not expect much from them as his judges, and that certainly did not help his case.

The general decision of the commission was a blow to Philip, requiring him to remove his garrisons from the cities under discussion, and accept the limitation of Macedon to its "ancient boundaries."[2] As for all the rest of the complaints, the legates deferred decisions until they could determine the procedure by which the disputes were to be settled. The commission then moved north to have further discussions about the issue of Ainos and Maroneia; Philip emphasized again that he considered the Romans to be treating him as an enemy, not as a friend, and hinted that he would be prepared to meet hostility with hostility. But the commission evidently did not feel that it had a mandate to adjudicate between Philip and Eumenes. They refused to make a final decision on the matter and referred it back to the senate.[3]

In the winter of 185/4, the senate heard the report of the Roman commission, as well as delegations from all the parties to the disputes. Evidently nothing new was said in the way of arguments, and the senate's judgement was as expected: Philip was indeed to relinquish Ainos and Maroneia, and not only that but the entire coast of Thrace outside the borders of Macedon. Relations between Rome and Macedon were worse now than at any time since the Second Macedonian War, and matters were not helped by Philip's machinations, which resulted in the massacre of the population at Maroneia (Livy 39.34). The obvious breach between Rome and Philip, and the positive reception given by Rome to Eumenes, the Thessalians, and the rest, encouraged others to believe that Rome was always happy to hear charges against Philip. Polybios, followed by Livy, states that the "embassy season" of 184/3 brought an unparalleled number of envoys to Rome bearing complaints against Philip.

The complaints of Philip's southern neighbours were of a different nature this time. The Thessalians and Perrhaibians, probably since shortly after 196, and perhaps as a result of a Roman arrangement, had had judicial treaties, *symbola*, with Philip.[4] In accordance with these treaties, disputes between Philip and his neighbours were to be settled by impartial arbitration.[5] The charges against

2. For now, Philip still retained some possessions in Thessaly. See Walbank, *Philip V*, p. 232.

3. Nevertheless, their limited and interim decision clearly went against Philip; he was to remove his garrisons until a final judgement was made.

4. See Gauthier, pp. 340–41; Gruen, p. 105. The actual status of these treaties may have been threatened or eroded by the fact of Philip's military aggressions and conquests during the Aitolian war. It is also possible that these *symbola* were a result of the arrangements the Roman legates promised to make after the meeting at Tempe.

5. The *symbola* as such should be applied to disputes of an individual or commercial nature. However, Polybios seems to imply that disputes of an interstate nature were also envisioned here; perhaps Philip and his neighbours had full-fledged arbitration treaties. See Gauthier, pp. 341–42.

Philip were that he was refusing to use the authorized courts for this judicial process, and, if he did agree to arbitration in the first place, he was bribing the judges. Clearly the judicial arrangements for arbitration between Philip and his neighbours had broken down. In the absence of further information it is difficult to accuse Philip simply of bad faith. However, it would probably be correct to say that he found it galling to have to deal with his former subjects as equals in a court of law. Those "subjects" of course now had another alternative: they could come to Rome.

In Rome they found a third party prepared, in general, to intervene and investigate, even though the fruits of Roman investigatory commissions were often negligible.[6] In some ways Rome in this period appeared as the ideal arbitrator. It still stood formally as a neutral outsider in the Greek world, yet its successful military ventures in the East had made it clear that it was now the power to be reckoned with. It was at least in part that military power that gave Rome's legates their Roman *auctoritas*. Prestige was an important requirement for an arbitrator. But for truly successful arbitration, arbitration that warrants the term in all ways, true neutrality was also vital. And in the case of Philip's relations with the rest of Greece in the 180s, it is clear that the neutrality of the Romans as arbitrators was greatly compromised by their past history of hostilities with Philip and by their present attitude to him.

107. A boundary arbitration between Othorne and Polichne (186/5 or 161/0?)

An inscription discovered in Larisa. H: 0.22–0.23 m; w: 0.33–0.35 m; d: 0.17 m.

*T. Axenidis, Ἑλληνικά 11 (1939) pp. 263–71.

Robert, *REG* 1941, 75; C. Habicht, *Klio* 52 (1970) p. 143; H. Kramolisch, *Die Strategen des thessalischen Bundes* (Bonn, 1978) p. 58 (B 8).

[- τὸ ὅρος τ]ὸ χαλούμ[ενον - - - - - - - - - -]
[- -]ἴ]δια εἶναι.^{vac} [μηνός ? - - - - - - - - -]
[- - στρατηγοῦντος τῶν Θετταλῶν Λεοντ]ομένους Φεραίο[υ - - - - - - - -]
[- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - ὅ]ρια τῆς χώρας πρὸς Τ . Μ/ - - - - - - - - -
[- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - αὐ]τῶι τῶι PAXONTI. κάτω ἐπὶ . . Α/ - - - - - - - -
[- - - - - - - - αὐτοῖς τοῖς ἄκρ]οις. ἄνω ἐπ' ἄκρον τὸ ὅρος τὸ [κ]αλ[ούμενον -]
[- - - - - ἀπὸ τοῦ Αἰγονομα?]ίου καταβαινόντων ἐπὶ τὸ μνῆμα - - - - - - - - - - -
[- - - - - - -αὐτοῖς τοῖς ἄκ]ροις. ἄνω ἐπ' ἄκρον τὸ ὅρος τὸ χαλούμεν[ον - - - -]
- - - - - - - - - -ίης Πολιχναίων χώρας. τούτων φημὶ τὰ ἐν τ[ὸς - - - - - - - - - -]

6. Cf. **95**, **96**, **102**, **112**, **123**, **143**, **148**.

Philip were that he was refusing to use the authorized courts for this judicial process, and, if he did agree to arbitration in the first place, he was bribing the judges. Clearly the judicial arrangements for arbitration between Philip and his neighbours had broken down. In the absence of further information it is difficult to accuse Philip simply of bad faith. However, it would probably be correct to say that he found it galling to have to deal with his former subjects as equals in a court of law. Those "subjects" of course now had another alternative: they could come to Rome.

In Rome they found a third party prepared, in general, to intervene and investigate, even though the fruits of Roman investigatory commissions were often negligible.[6] In some ways Rome in this period appeared as the ideal arbitrator. It still stood formally as a neutral outsider in the Greek world, yet its successful military ventures in the East had made it clear that it was now the power to be reckoned with. It was at least in part that military power that gave Rome's legates their Roman *auctoritas*. Prestige was an important requirement for an arbitrator. But for truly successful arbitration, arbitration that warrants the term in all ways, true neutrality was also vital. And in the case of Philip's relations with the rest of Greece in the 180s, it is clear that the neutrality of the Romans as arbitrators was greatly compromised by their past history of hostilities with Philip and by their present attitude to him.

107. A boundary arbitration between Othorne and Polichne (186/5 or 161/0?)

An inscription discovered in Larisa. H: 0.22–0.23 m; w: 0.33–0.35 m; d: 0.17 m.

*T. Axenidis, Ἑλληνικά 11 (1939) pp. 263–71.

Robert, *REG* 1941, 75; C. Habicht, *Klio* 52 (1970) p. 143; H. Kramolisch, *Die Strategen des thessalischen Bundes* (Bonn, 1978) p. 58 (B 8).

[- τὸ ὅρος τ]ὸ χαλούμ[ενον - - - - - - - - - -]
[- -]ἴ]δια εἶναι.^{vac} [μηνός ? - - - - - - - - -]
[- - στρατηγοῦντος τῶν Θετταλῶν Λεοντ]ομένους Φεραίο[υ - - - - - - - -]
[- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - ὅ]ρια τῆς χώρας πρὸς Τ . Μ/ - - - - - - - - -
[- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - αὐ]τῶι τῶι PAXONTI. κάτω ἐπὶ . . Α/ - - - - - - - -
[- - - - - - - - αὐτοῖς τοῖς ἄκρ]οις. ἄνω ἐπ' ἄκρον τὸ ὅρος τὸ [κ]αλ[ούμενον -]
[- - - - - ἀπὸ τοῦ Αἰγονομα?]ίου καταβαινόντων ἐπὶ τὸ μνῆμα - - - - - - - - - - -
[- - - - - - -αὐτοῖς τοῖς ἄκ]ροις. ἄνω ἐπ' ἄκρον τὸ ὅρος τὸ χαλούμεν[ον - - - -]
- - - - - - - - - -ίης Πολιχναίων χώρας. τούτων φημὶ τὰ ἐν τ[ὸς - - - - - - - - - -]

6. Cf. **95**, **96**, **102**, **112**, **123**, **143**, **148**.

[- - - - - - τᾶc] χρίcιος εἰcδοθ̣είcας καὶ τῶν ὑφ' ἑκάτερας [τῶν πόλεων - - - - - -]
- - - - - - - - -μένων πὸτ τὰc πόλειc φιλάνθρωπον cυ[μβουλάν? - - - - - - - - -]
- - - - - - - - τὰν ἀμφιc̣βατουμέναγ χώραγ κατὰ τὰ [ἄν]ω̣ - - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - τ̣ὰμ πόλιν τὰν 'Οθορνέων ἀπ' ἄκρου τοῦ ὄρεος τοῦ [καλουμένου - - -]
[- - - - - 'Αντιβούλ]ε̣ιομ μνᾶμα καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ 'Αντιβουλείου αὐτοῖc [τοῖc ἄκροις - - - -]
[- - - - - - - - - 'Α]ι̣γονομαῖογ καὶ αὐτοῖc τοῖc ἄκροις τοῦ Α̣ἰγονομ̣[αίου - - - - -]
[- - - - - - - - -'Αγ]εμάχειογ καὶ ἀπὸ τούτου αὐτοῖc τοῖc ἄχ̣[ροις - - - - - -]
[- - - - - - - - - - κ]αὶ ἀπὸ τούτου αὐτοῖc τοῖc ἄκροις ἕως Π̣- - - - - - - - - - - -
[- - - - - - - - δεδό?]ρκαντι ἐν τᾶι κεκριμέναι χώραι Μ̣Α̣- - - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - - -Ι̣ καὶ εἴ τινες ἐν τοῖc πρότερο̣γ χ[ρόνοις - - - - - - - - - - -]
[- - - - ἐν τᾶι χώραι νε]γομεύκαντι ἢ ξύλα κε̣χ̣[όφαντι - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
- - - - - - - - - - - -cθαι μηδὲ περὶ ἓ̣γ ὄ̣[ρος - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
[- - - - - - - - - - - ἀπο]τ̣εῖcαι τὸ τίμα̣[μα -]
[- - - - - - - - - - - αὐτ]ᾶc τᾶc χώρ̣[ας -]
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -Α̣ΑΛ- -

2: ΔΙΑΕ̣ΙΝΑΙ ˅ Λ: Axenidis facsimile. || 3: [στρατηγοῦντος τῶν Θετταλῶν Δαμοθοίνου Λεοντ]ομένους Φεραίο[υ]: suggested as a possibility by Kramolisch. || 18: ΚΕΚΡΙΜΕΝΑΙΧΩΧΑΙΜΑ̣: Axenidis facsimile. || 21: ΠΕΡΙΓ̣Ν̣Ο̣: Axenidis facsimile. || 24: Α̣ΑΛ: Axenidis facsimile.

The style of this fragmented Thessalian inscription points to the second century. The name "Leontomenes of Pherai" can be restored, and if Leontomenes is indeed the strategos here, then the inscription can perhaps be dated to 186/5; if the strategos is Damothoinos, the son of Leontomenes, the date of the inscription may be as late as 161/0.[1] It is possible that the present boundary arbitration represents a second judgement, one that referred back to an older one in the *strategia* of Leontomenes (or Damothoinos).[2] The two minor poleis mentioned in the inscription, Othorne and Polichne, clearly had a boundary dispute with each other. Much of what remains on the stone is a boundary demarcation. There are references to a judgement (line 10) and to a portion of contested land (line 12). The identity of the arbitrator remains a mystery, and the provenance of the inscription (Larisa) is of no help. For one thing, the stone was clearly moved; for another, Larisa, and especially its temple of Apollo Kerdoios, acted

1. See Kramolisch, p. 58; cf. **139**.

2. Axenidis, p. 269. In the inscription recording the ongoing dispute between Melitaia and Narthakion (**156**), several earlier judgements were referred to (**32**, **79**, **154**). That the present inscription is referring back to an earlier judgement is suggested by the fact that the date formula with Leontomenes' name does not introduce the inscription.

as a central archives for arbitration decrees.[3] The appearance of the word φημί suggests a single arbitrator, with some degree of prestige; Axenidis suggested a Roman general or consul.

108. Treaty between Herakleia and Miletos providing for arbitration (185/4)

A marble stele, containing a treaty between Herakleia and Miletos, discovered in the Delphinion at Miletos. H: 3.015 m (inscribed surface: 2.76 m); w (inscribed surface): 0.76–0.85 m; d: 0.22–0.28 m. Only the relevant portion of the lengthy treaty is included here.

*Rehm, *Milet* I.3, 150; Dittenberger/Hiller von Gaertringen, *SIG*^{3} 633.

U. von Wilamowitz, *GGA* 2 (1914) pp. 94, 103–4; Robert, *REG* 1943, 63; Magie, *RRAM*, vol. 1, p. 113; vol. 2, pp. 962, 965; Robert, *REG* 1965, 291; id., *REG* 1966, 312; Gawantka, pp. 149–50, 211; H. Müller, *Chiron* 5 (1975) pp. 142–43; id., *Milesische Volksbeschlüsse*, Hypomnemata 47 (Göttingen, 1976) pp. 25, 33, 45–46, 48–51; L. Robert, *BCH* 102 (1978) pp. 507f.; Berthold, p. 167; Gruen, p. 110; M. Wörrle, *Chiron* 18 (1988) pp. 421–70; R. M. Errington, *Chiron* 19 (1989) pp. 279–88; Ager, *Historia* 40 (1991) pp. 28–29.

περὶ δὲ τοῦ μέρους τῆς χώρας τῆς ὀρεινῆς τῆς ἀμφισβητουμένης, ἣν Μιλήσιοι μὲν ἀποφαίνο[υ]-
σιν εἶναι τῆς Μυησίας ἱερὰν ὑπάρχουσαν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ Τερβινθέως, καὶ ἣν εἶναί φασιν
τῆς Τηΐας καὶ τῶν κεκτημένων ἐγ Κυσσήλει, Ἡρακλεῶται δὲ τῆς Κισαρίδος καὶ τῆς πρὸς
τῶι Κυκλωπείωι καὶ τῆς δημοσίας καὶ ἱερᾶς, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ περὶ τοῦ τόπου, ἐν ὧι τὸ {τε}
πλινθούλκιόν ἐστιν, καὶ τοῦ συνεχοῦς τούτωι τόπου, ὃμ Μιλήσιοι μὲν ἀποφαί-
νουσιν τῆς
Ἰωνοπολίτιδος, Ἡρακλεῶται δὲ τῆς ἑαυτῶν, συναινέσαι Μιλησίους καὶ Ἡρα-
κλεώτας πό-
⟨λ⟩ιν ἐλευθέραν καὶ δημοκρατουμένην, ἐξ ἧς λήψονται δικαστάς, ὅσους ἂν κοινῆ⟨ι⟩ φαίνη-
ται, οἵτινες ἐπὶ τοὺς τόπους παραγενόμενοι ποιήσονται τὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀμφισβη-
τουμένων κρίσιν, ἑκάτερον ἐν τῶι ἐνιαυτῶι τῶι μετὰ στεφανηφόρον Μένανδρον. εἰ δέ
τινά ἐστιν ἐν τοῖς τόποις τούτοις ἐγκάρπια, μεσειδιωθήτω ἕως κρίσεως.

3. Cf. 70, 153.

as a central archives for arbitration decrees.[3] The appearance of the word φημί suggests a single arbitrator, with some degree of prestige; Axenidis suggested a Roman general or consul.

108. Treaty between Herakleia and Miletos providing for arbitration (185/4)

A marble stele, containing a treaty between Herakleia and Miletos, discovered in the Delphinion at Miletos. H: 3.015 m (inscribed surface: 2.76 m); w (inscribed surface): 0.76–0.85 m; d: 0.22–0.28 m. Only the relevant portion of the lengthy treaty is included here.

*Rehm, *Milet* I.3, 150; Dittenberger/Hiller von Gaertringen, *SIG*^{3} 633.

U. von Wilamowitz, *GGA* 2 (1914) pp. 94, 103–4; Robert, *REG* 1943, 63; Magie, *RRAM*, vol. 1, p. 113; vol. 2, pp. 962, 965; Robert, *REG* 1965, 291; id., *REG* 1966, 312; Gawantka, pp. 149–50, 211; H. Müller, *Chiron* 5 (1975) pp. 142–43; id., *Milesische Volksbeschlüsse*, Hypomnemata 47 (Göttingen, 1976) pp. 25, 33, 45–46, 48–51; L. Robert, *BCH* 102 (1978) pp. 507f.; Berthold, p. 167; Gruen, p. 110; M. Wörrle, *Chiron* 18 (1988) pp. 421–70; R. M. Errington, *Chiron* 19 (1989) pp. 279–88; Ager, *Historia* 40 (1991) pp. 28–29.

περὶ δὲ τοῦ μέρους τῆς χώρας τῆς ὀρεινῆς τῆς ἀμφισβητουμένης, ἣν Μιλήσιοι μὲν ἀποφαίνο[υ]-
σιν εἶναι τῆς Μυησίας ἱερὰν ὑπάρχουσαν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ Τερβινθέως, καὶ ἣν εἶναί φασιν
τῆς Τηΐας καὶ τῶν κεκτημένων ἐγ Κυσσήλει, Ἡρακλεῶται δὲ τῆς Κισαρίδος καὶ τῆς πρὸς
τῶι Κυκλωπείωι καὶ τῆς δημοσίας καὶ ἱερᾶς, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ περὶ τοῦ τόπου, ἐν ὧι τὸ {τε}
πλινθούλκιόν ἐστιν, καὶ τοῦ συνεχοῦς τούτωι τόπου, ὃμ Μιλήσιοι μὲν ἀποφαί-
νουσιν τῆς
Ἰωνοπολίτιδος, Ἡρακλεῶται δὲ τῆς ἑαυτῶν, συναινέσαι Μιλησίους καὶ Ἡρα-
κλεώτας πό-
⟨λ⟩ιν ἐλευθέραν καὶ δημοκρατουμένην, ἐξ ἧς λήψονται δικαστάς, ὅσους ἂν κοινῆ⟨ι⟩ φαίνη-
ται, οἵτινες ἐπὶ τοὺς τόπους παραγενόμενοι ποιήσονται τὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀμφισβη-
τουμένων κρίσιν, ἑκάτερον ἐν τῶι ἐνιαυτῶι τῶι μετὰ στεφανηφόρον Μένανδρον. εἰ δέ
τινά ἐστιν ἐν τοῖς τόποις τούτοις ἐγκάρπια, μεσειδιωθήτω ἕως κρίσεως.

3. Cf. 70, 153.

Rehm tentatively dated this treaty between the Asia Minor states of Herakleia on the Latmos and Miletos to April of the year 180. However, recent arguments have been advanced in favour of redating the agreement to the year 185/4, and placing it in the context of the period just prior to the arbitration between Miletos and Magnesia (**109**).[1] The document is one of the numerous examples of treaties between Greek states that provided for future arbitration.[2] The treaty itself provides for an isopolitical association between the two states of Miletos and Herakleia on the Latmos. Both states, we learn from this inscription, were allied to Rhodes.[3] And, as we also learn from this inscription, Miletos and Herakleia had recently been at war with each other.[4] Apparently this did not violate their agreement with Rhodes, though one is tempted to speculate that the latter state had a hand in putting a stop to the hostilities between its two allies. There is no evidence for this, but the station of mediator was one often assumed by Rhodes.

One, at least, of the factors in the Herakleia-Miletos war would have been the dispute over certain territories, territories that provided income from produce and manufacture. In the post-Apameia settlement of Manlius Vulso, Miletos had been granted territory, including a tract of "sacred land."[5] The isopolity agreement of 185/4 tells us that part of the territory claimed by both Miletos and Herakleia was said by Miletos to be "the sacred land of Myos." It therefore seems reasonable to assume that at least part of the dispute between Herakleia and Miletos sprang from the settlement of Asia Minor in 188.[6] This dispute was to be resolved by a third party, a "free and democratic" state, on which both cities were to agree.[7] One interesting stipulation of this agreement is that in the interim between the formulation of the treaty and the final settlement the

1. See **109** and the arguments adduced by Errington in favour of redating the Magnesia-Miletos treaty, as well as the present treaty between Herakleia and Miletos and the sympolity between Miletos and Pidasa (**103**).

2. Cf. **67**, **71**, **164**, **170**. In particular, see **13**, a sympolitical agreement in some ways similar to the present isopolitical agreement; and **33**, which also provided for arbitration over a specific territory.

3. Lines 35–36. The promise made by both sides to adhere to their separate alliances with Rhodes is echoed in the late-second-century treaty between Lato and Hierapytna, in which the state of Lyttos played some kind of indirect role (**32** Appendix).

4. Lines 36–37. For ἀμνηστία of charges arising from the war, cf. **71**, **109**.

5. See **98** and Polyb. 21.45.

6. An inscription from Herakleia records the reply of Vulso and the decemvirate to an embassy from that city in 188 (*SIG*^{3} 618). While responding favourably to Herakleia's overtures, and agreeing to grant Herakleia the status of a free city, no mention is made of any territorial concessions. Herakleia may also have been disturbed by the rapprochement c. 188/7 between Miletos and Pidasa, Herakleia's southern neighbour (**103**).

7. Cf. **120** (B, line 16).

produce of the disputed region was to be placed under the guardianship of a neutral third party (lines 86–87).

109. Rhodes and other states mediate a peace between Magnesia and Miletos (second half of the 180s)

Four fragments of a marble stele discovered in the Delphinion at Miletos. See Rehm, *Milet,* p.341, and F. Mezger, "Inscriptio Milesiaca de pace cum Magnetibus facta" (Diss., Munich, 1913) p. 54, for epigraphic details.

*Rehm, *Milet* I.3, 148; Mezger, pp. 55f.; Dittenberger/Hiller von Gaertringen, *SIG*^{3} 588; Daverio Rocchi, pp. 126–29, no. 11 (lines 28–38).

U. von Wilamowitz, *GGA* 2 (1914) p. 94; Rostovtzeff, *SEHHW*, vol. 2, p. 634; Holleaux, *Études*, vol. 4, pp. 229–32, 331; Magie, *RRAM*, vol. 1, pp. 113, 204; vol. 2, pp. 944–45, 964; L. Robert, *Anatolia* 4 (1959) pp. 15–24; Robert, *REG* 1960, 350; Préaux, pp. 254–58, 279; *SEG* XIX.677; Schmitt, *Antiochos*, pp. 281f.; Robert, *REG* 1965, 291; H. Müller, *Chiron* 5 (1975) pp. 141–42; id., *Milesische Volksbeschlüsse,* Hypomnemata 47 (Göttingen, 1976) p. 50; H. R. Rawlings, *AJAH* 1 (1976) pp. 12–13; Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 3, p. 169; Will, vol. 2, p. 184; Berthold, p. 148; Gruen, pp. 540, 542; Burstein 37; M. Wörrle, *Chiron* 18 (1988) pp. 421–70; R. M. Errington, *Chiron* 19 (1989) pp. 279–88; Ager, *Historia* 40 (1991) pp. 20–23.

Cυνθῆκαι Μ̣[ιλ]ησίων καὶ Μαγ̣[νήτων.]

§1 ἀγαθῆι τύχηι· ἐπὶ τοῖσδε cυ[νε]λύθησαν Μάγνητες καὶ Μιλή̣[cιοι]
cυνλυcάντων αὐτοὺc τῶν π̣[αρα]γεγενημένων πρεcβευτῶν χ̣α̣[ὶ]
[κ]αταcτησάντων εἰc τὴν ἐξ ἀρ̣χ̣[ῆc φι]λίαν ἀπὸ μὲν τῶν πόλεων· Ῥ̣[ο]-
5 [δ]ίων Φιλοcτράτου τοῦ Ἀ̣ . . . ω̣ . . . . . Ια τοῦ Cωcικράτους, καθ' ὑοθεcί[αν . δὲ]
[Β]άτωνος, Νικοcτράτου [τοῦ Τ]ειc̣ύλου, Ἀ̣[θ]ηναίων Ἀλεξίωνος τοῦ
C̣πευcίππου Ἀζην[ιέω]c, Θεο[κ]λ̣ε̣ίους [το]ῦ̣ Δεξιθέου Φυ̣λ̣ακίου, Θεοπό̣[μ]-
[π]ο̣υ τοῦ Δημοκλείους ἐκ [Κο]λ̣ω̣ν̣(έ)ω̣ν̣, Κ̣νι̣δ[ίων Π]τολεμαίου τοῦ Χερ̣ . . . . .,
[Ἀρ]χεcτράτου το[ῦ Ἀ]ρ̣χ̣ιδάμ̣ου, [Μυ]νδίων . . . 12 . . . ευc, Ἡγέμ̣ο[ν]ο[c τοῦ . . .]
10 [ά]ρ̣χ̣ο̣υ̣, Caμίων Θεομνήcτου το[ῦ] Ἀλέξο[υ, - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -,]
[C]τηcαγόρου τοῦ Θεc(c)αλοῦ, Ἁλικαρνα[cceών - - - - - - - - - - - - - -,]
[Θ]εομνήcτου τοῦ Ἱεροκλείους, Παυc̣α̣[νίου τοῦ - - - - - - - - - - -, Καυ]-
[ν]ίων Διονυcικλείους τοῦ Ὀλυμπίχο[υ, - - - - - - - - - - - - - -, Μυλα]-
[c]ε̣έων Ἀπολλωνίου τοῦ Νυcίου, Ἰάco[νοc τοῦ Διονυcίου,]
15 [Ὑ]c̣caλδώμου τοῦ Εἰρηναίου, Τηΐω[ν - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
[Ἀ]ντιπάτρου τοῦ Νυμφοδώρου, Κυζι[κηνῶν - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]

produce of the disputed region was to be placed under the guardianship of a neutral third party (lines 86–87).

109. Rhodes and other states mediate a peace between Magnesia and Miletos (second half of the 180s)

Four fragments of a marble stele discovered in the Delphinion at Miletos. See Rehm, *Milet,* p.341, and F. Mezger, "Inscriptio Milesiaca de pace cum Magnetibus facta" (Diss., Munich, 1913) p. 54, for epigraphic details.

*Rehm, *Milet* I.3, 148; Mezger, pp. 55f.; Dittenberger/Hiller von Gaertringen, *SIG*^{3} 588; Daverio Rocchi, pp. 126–29, no. 11 (lines 28–38).

U. von Wilamowitz, *GGA* 2 (1914) p. 94; Rostovtzeff, *SEHHW*, vol. 2, p. 634; Holleaux, *Études*, vol. 4, pp. 229–32, 331; Magie, *RRAM*, vol. 1, pp. 113, 204; vol. 2, pp. 944–45, 964; L. Robert, *Anatolia* 4 (1959) pp. 15–24; Robert, *REG* 1960, 350; Préaux, pp. 254–58, 279; *SEG* XIX.677; Schmitt, *Antiochos*, pp. 281f.; Robert, *REG* 1965, 291; H. Müller, *Chiron* 5 (1975) pp. 141–42; id., *Milesische Volksbeschlüsse,* Hypomnemata 47 (Göttingen, 1976) p. 50; H. R. Rawlings, *AJAH* 1 (1976) pp. 12–13; Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 3, p. 169; Will, vol. 2, p. 184; Berthold, p. 148; Gruen, pp. 540, 542; Burstein 37; M. Wörrle, *Chiron* 18 (1988) pp. 421–70; R. M. Errington, *Chiron* 19 (1989) pp. 279–88; Ager, *Historia* 40 (1991) pp. 20–23.

Cυνθῆκαι Μ̣[ιλ]ησίων καὶ Μαγ̣[νήτων.]

§1 ἀγαθῆι τύχηι· ἐπὶ τοῖσδε cυ[νε]λύθησαν Μάγνητες καὶ Μιλή̣[cιοι]
cυνλυcάντων αὐτοὺc τῶν π̣[αρα]γεγενημένων πρεcβευτῶν χ̣α̣[ὶ]
[κ]αταcτησάντων εἰc τὴν ἐξ ἀρ̣χ̣[ῆc φι]λίαν ἀπὸ μὲν τῶν πόλεων· Ῥ̣[ο]-
5 [δ]ίων Φιλοcτράτου τοῦ Ἀ̣ . . . ω̣ . . . . . Ια τοῦ Cωcικράτους, καθ' ὑοθεcί[αν . δὲ]
[Β]άτωνος, Νικοcτράτου [τοῦ Τ]ειc̣ύλου, Ἀ̣[θ]ηναίων Ἀλεξίωνος τοῦ
C̣πευcίππου Ἀζην[ιέω]c, Θεο[κ]λ̣ε̣ίους [το]ῦ̣ Δεξιθέου Φυ̣λ̣ακίου, Θεοπό̣[μ]-
[π]ο̣υ τοῦ Δημοκλείους ἐκ [Κο]λ̣ω̣ν̣(έ)ω̣ν̣, Κ̣νι̣δ[ίων Π]τολεμαίου τοῦ Χερ̣ . . . . .,
[Ἀρ]χεcτράτου το[ῦ Ἀ]ρ̣χ̣ιδάμ̣ου, [Μυ]νδίων . . . 12 . . . ευc, Ἡγέμ̣ο[ν]ο[c τοῦ . . .]
10 [ά]ρ̣χ̣ο̣υ̣, Caμίων Θεομνήcτου το[ῦ] Ἀλέξο[υ, - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -,]
[C]τηcαγόρου τοῦ Θεc(c)αλοῦ, Ἁλικαρνα[cceών - - - - - - - - - - - - - -,]
[Θ]εομνήcτου τοῦ Ἱεροκλείους, Παυc̣α̣[νίου τοῦ - - - - - - - - - - -, Καυ]-
[ν]ίων Διονυcικλείους τοῦ Ὀλυμπίχο[υ, - - - - - - - - - - - - - -, Μυλα]-
[c]ε̣έων Ἀπολλωνίου τοῦ Νυcίου, Ἰάco[νοc τοῦ Διονυcίου,]
15 [Ὑ]c̣caλδώμου τοῦ Εἰρηναίου, Τηΐω[ν - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
[Ἀ]ντιπάτρου τοῦ Νυμφοδώρου, Κυζι[κηνῶν - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]

[τ]οῦ Ἀντιχράτου, Ἀχαιοῦ τοῦ Συννόμο[υ, - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν Δα[μοξένου τοῦ - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
ἀπὸ Μεγάλης πόλεως Φρασιαρίδα το[ῦ - - - - - - - - - - -, ἀπ' Ἀντιγο]-
[ν]ε̣ίας Διοκλείου⟨ς τοῦ⟩ Ἀγησιλόχου, ἀπὸ Πατ̣[ρῶν - - - - - - - - - τοῦ]
Σελεύκου, Ἀριστείδου τοῦ [- - - - - - - - - - - - - καὶ τῶν ἐπὶ τὴν]
[σύ]νθεσιν ἀποσταλέντων παρὰ [μὲν Μαγνήτων - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
[τ]οῦ Διοσκουρίδου, Ἐπιχράτου τοῦ Δι[οκλείους, Πυθοδότ]ου τοῦ Χαρι-
σ̣ί̣ου, Πυθοκλείους τοῦ Ἡγη̣ς̣[ίππου, Δ]η̣μ̣η̣τ̣ρ̣ί̣ο̣υ̣ τοῦ Ε̣ὐ̣μήδου[ς,]
[παρὰ] δὲ Μιλησίων Θεογ̣[ένους] τ̣οῦ Λεωδάμαντος, Ἀλεξάνδ̣-
[ρου τοῦ Δημητρίου, Δαμ]α̣σίου τοῦ Γλαυκίππου, Ἀντιγόνου τ̣ο̣[ῦ]
§2 [Ἑκαταί]ο̣υ, Ἀ̣ρ̣τ̣ε̣μιδώρου τοῦ Ἡροδότου· || εἶναι εἰς ἅπαντα τὸ[ν]
§3 [χρ]ό̣νον εἰρήνην καὶ φιλίαν Μάγνησι καὶ Μιλησίοις· || τῆς δὲ χώρ[ας]
[τ]ῆς περαίας, ὑπὲρ ἧς διεφέροντο Μάγνητες καὶ Μιλήσιο[ι, ὅ]-
[ρ]ον ὑπάρχειν αὐτοῖς τὸν Ὕβανδον ποταμὸν καὶ ἀπὸ τ̣ο̣[ῦ]
[πο]ταμοῦ τούτου τὴμ μὲν ὑπεράνω πᾶσαν εἶναι Μαγνήτων, τὴ[ν δ']
[ἀπ]οκάτω πᾶσαν ἕως θαλάσσης εἶναι Μιλησίων· κ̣αταπῆ[ξαι]
[δὲ] πέτρους καὶ στῆσαι ἐπ' αὐτῷ̣ν στήλας ἑκατέρους παρὰ [τὸ ῥεῖ]-
[θρο]ν̣ τοῦ ποταμοῦ ἐν τοῖς αὐτῶν μέρεσιν, καθότι ἐπέγνωσαν
[το]ὺς τόπους παραγενόμενοι οἱ ἀπεσταλμένοι ἐπὶ τὰς συνλύ[σεις]
[πρ]εσβευταί, καὶ εἶναι αὐτοῖς ὅρον διὰ παντὸς τό τε νῦν ὑπάρχ̣[ον]
[ῥεῖ]θρον τοῦ ποταμοῦ τοῦ Ὑβάν̣δ̣ο̣υ̣ καὶ τοὺς παρατεθέντας π[έτ]-
§4 ρους καὶ τὰς ἐπ' αὐτῶν στήλας· || ἵνα δὲ ὦσιν ἀσφαλεῖς αἱ σ̣[υνλύ]-
[σει]ς καὶ διαμένηι ἡ εἰρήνη καὶ φιλία εἰς τὸν ἀεὶ χρόνον ἀμφοτέραι̣[ς]
[τ]αῖς πόλεσιν, μὴ εἶναι μήτε Μάγνησιν τὴν Μιλησίων χώραν μ̣[ή]-
[τ]ε̣ τὴν περαίαν μήτε ἄλλην μηδεμίαν μηδὲ φρούριον, μήτε Μιλησί̣ο̣[ις]
[τὴ]ν Μαγνήτων χώραν μήτε τὴν περαίαν μήτε ἄλλην μηδεμίαν μη̣δ̣[ὲ]
[φρ]ο̣ύριον παρὰ μηθενὸς λ̣αβεῖν μήτε δι' α̣ὐτῶν μήτε δι' ἑτέρων μήτ⟨ε⟩ ἐγ
κ̣τ̣[ήσει]
[μή]τε ἐν δόσει μήτε ἐν ἀναθέσει μήτε ⟨ἐν⟩ καθιερώσει μήτε κατ' ἄλλον τρόπ[ον
μη]-
[θέ]να μηδὲ κατὰ παρεύρεσιν μηδεμίαν· εἰ δὲ μ̣ή, ἄ̣κυρον εἶναι τ̣ὴγ γενομέ̣ν̣[ην]
[δ]ό̣σιν ἢ ἀνάθεσιν ἢ καθιέρωσιν ἢ κτῆσιν ἢ ἐάν τις γένηται παρεύρεσι̣[ς ἢ] τρό-
§5 [πο]ς τισποτεοῦν ἢ δι' αὐτῷ̣ν ἢ δι' ἑτέρων. || τοῖς δὲ ἔχουσιν σῦλο̣ν̣ ἢ κατὰ
Μαγ[νή]-
των ἢ κατὰ Μιλησίων μηδὲ ἑτ̣έ̣ραμ̣ πόλιν ὁρμητήρια παρέχειν μηδ' ὑπ̣[ο]-
[δ]έχεσθαι μηθὲν τῶν λαμβανομένων τ[ρ]όπωι μηθενὶ̣ μηδὲ παρεῦ̣[ρέ]-
§6 [σ]ει μηδεμιᾶι· || ἐὰν δέ̣ τινα τῶν̣ ἀπ[ες]χ̣ε̣υ̣α̣σμένων ἢ μεθεσταμένω[ν]
ἐ̣ν τῶι συνστάντι πολέμωι βούλωνται μετάγειν ἢ Μάγνητες διὰ τῆς Μ̣[ι]-
λ̣ησίων χώρας ἢ Μιλήσιοι διὰ τῆς Μαγνήτων, εἶναι αὐτοὺς ἀτελεῖς, ἐ-
ὰ̣μ̣ μετάγωσιν μετὰ μῆνας δύο ἀπὸ τοῦ χρόνου τοῦ τῆς συνθήκη̣[ς.] ||
§7 ὅ̣σ̣α δ' ἂν κατὰ πόλεμον ἀποσκευάζωνται ἢ μεθιστάνωσιν ἢ Μάγνητ[ες]
εἰς τὴν Μιλησίων ἢ Μιλήσιοι εἰς τὴν Μαγνήτων ἢ οἱ κ̣α̣τοικοῦντες ἐ̣ν̣ [ἐ]-
[κ]ατέ[ρ]α̣⟨ι⟩ τῶν πόλεων ἢ διάγωσι̣ν̣, [ἵ]ν̣α̣ ἀποκαθιστάνωσιν εἰς τὴν ἰδίαν, ε[ἶ]-
[ν]α̣[ι] ταῦτα ἀτελῆ καὶ προνοεῖν [ὑ]πὲρ α̣ὐτῶν τοῦς ἄρχοντας τοὺς ἐν ἑκα-
§8 [τέ]ρ̣αι τῶν πόλεων. || εἶναι δὲ τὴν α̣ὐ̣τ̣ὴν εἰρήνην καὶ Πριηνεῦσι τοῖς συνμα-

§9 [χή]ϲαϲι Μάγνηϲιν καὶ Ἡρακλεώταιϲ τοῖϲ ϲυνμαχήϲαϲι Μιληϲίοιϲ. || ὁπό-
60 [ϲ]ο̣ι δὲ ϲτρατηγ[έ]τ̣αι ἢ ἐϲτρατηγήκαϲιν ἢ ἦγηνται ἢ ϲυνηργήκαϲιν ἡϊτινιοῦ̣[ν]
[π]ό̣λει τῶν προγεγραμμένων ἢ ϲυνμεμαχήκαϲιν τ̣ρόπωι ὁτωιοῦν, ὑπάρχει[ν]
πᾶϲ[ι] τούτοιϲ ἄδ̣ειαν καὶ ἀμνηϲτίαν, ὧν πεπράχαϲιν ἐν τῶι πολέμωι, καὶ μὴ
ὑ̣π̣[έ]-
[χ]ε̣ιν αὐτοὺϲ ἔγκλημα μήτε δημοϲίαι μήτε ἰδίαι πε̣ρὶ μηθενὸϲ τῶν προγεγονό̣-
§10 τ̣ων ἕωϲ τ̣οῦ τῆϲ ϲυνθήκηϲ χρόνου. || ὁπόϲα δ̣ὲ αἰχμάλωτα ϲώματα πολ̣[ι]-
65 τικὰ εἰλημμένα ἐν τῶι πολέμωι ἐϲτὶν ἢ ἐμ Μαγνηϲίαι ἢ ἐμ Μιλήτωι
ἢ ἐ̣ν Ἡρακλέαι ἢ ἐν ⟨Πριήνηι ἐν⟩ δημοϲίωι, ἀποδοῦναι ἑκάϲτημ πόλιν τὸν
ἴϲον [ἀρ]ι̣θμὸν δι[ὰ]
τ̣ῷ̣ν πρεϲβειῶν τῶν ἀπεϲταλμένων ἐπὶ τὰϲ ϲυ̣λύϲειϲ· τοὺϲ δὲ ὑπεράγον-
τ̣αϲ αἰχμαλώτουϲ τοὺϲ Μιληϲίων χαριζόμενοϲ ὁ δῆμοϲ ὁ Μ̣αγ̣νήτων ἔδωκεν
[ἄ]-
[ν]ε̣υ̣ λύτρου Ῥοδίοιϲ· τοὺϲ δὲ ὄντ̣αϲ αἰχμαλώτουϲ παρὰ τοῖϲ ἰδιώταιϲ Μαγ-
ν̣[ή]-
70 τ̣ων ἢ Πριηνέων ἢ Μιληϲίων ἢ Ἡρακλεωτῶν ἐ̣κλυτροῦϲθαι Μάγνητ̣αϲ μέ[ν,]
[ὅ]ϲοι ἂν ὦϲιν Μιληϲίων ἢ Ἡρακλ̣εωτῶν ἐμ Μ̣α̣γ̣[νη]ϲ[ί]α̣ι ἢ Πριήνη⟨ι⟩, Μιλη-
ϲίουϲ δ̣[έ,]
[ὅϲοι] ἂν ὦϲιν Μαγνήτων ἢ Πριηνέων ἐμ Μ̣ι̣λ̣ήτωι κ̣α̣ὶ ἐν Ἡρακλέαι· ἀναπέμ̣-
[πειν δὲ] . . ιι . . ι̣ν πρ . . 12 . . τοὺϲ ἄρχοντ̣αϲ τοὺϲ ἐν τ̣[αῖϲ]
[πόλεϲιν ἑκάϲταιϲ - - - - - - - - - - -]I . . . υ . . . . α κατὰ τῶ̣ν . .
75 -ε̣ϲ πρὸϲ τοὺ[ϲ - - -]

Some lines missing

[. . . ιι . . . εἰ]ϲ τ̣ὸ̣ [ἱερὸν? - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
§11 [κυρωθειϲῶν δὲ] τ̣ῶν ϲυνθηκῶν ο̣[ἱ μὲν παρὰ Μαγνήτων ἀπεϲταλμένοι πρεϲ-
βευταὶ]
[παραγενόμεν]οι εἰϲ Μίλητον ὁρκιϲά̣τ̣[ωϲαν τὸν δῆμον τὸν Μιληϲίων· οἱ δὲ
παρὰ]
[Μιληϲίων ἀπεϲ]ταλμένοι ἐπὶ τὴν ϲύνθεϲι̣ν̣ [παραγενόμενοι εἰϲ Μαγνηϲίαν
ὁρκιϲά]-
80 [τωϲαν τὸν δῆμο]ν̣ τὸν Μαγνήτων· ὅρκια δὲ π̣α̣[ρεχέτωϲαν Μάγνητεϲ μὲν
Μιληϲί]-
[οιϲ, Μιλήϲιοι δὲ] Μ̣άγνηϲιν· ὀμνύτωϲαν δὲ ἱερὰ κα[ίοντεϲ τὸν ὅρκον τὸν
ὑπογε]-
[γραμμένον· ὅρκο]ϲ Μαγνήτων· ὀμνύω τὴν Ἄρτεμιν [τὴν Λευκοφρυηνὴν καὶ
τοὺϲ]
[ἄλλουϲ θεοὺϲ πά]ν̣τ̣αϲ καὶ πάϲαϲ διαφυλάξειν τὰϲ ϲυ̣ν̣[θήκαϲ καὶ ἐμμενεῖν
τοῖϲ]
[δεδογμένοιϲ καὶ] μ̣ὴ μνηϲικακήϲειν περὶ μηθενὸϲ τῶν πρ̣ο̣[γεγονότων· εὐορ]-
85 [κοῦντι μὲν εὖ εἶνα]ι, ἐφιορκοῦντι δὲ τἀναντία. ὅρκοϲ Μιληϲίων· ὀμ̣ν̣[ύω τὸν
Ἀπόλλω]-
[να τὸν Διδυμέα καὶ] τοὺϲ ἄλλουϲ θεοὺϲ πάντ̣αϲ καὶ πάϲαϲ διαφυλάξειν τ̣ὰ̣[ϲ]
[ϲυνθήκαϲ καὶ ἐμ]μενεῖν τοῖϲ δεδογμένοιϲ καὶ μὴ μνηϲικακήϲειν περὶ μηθε̣-
[νὸϲ τῶν προγεγο]ν̣ότων· εὐορκοῦντι μὲν εὖ εἶναι, ἐφιορκοῦντι δὲ τἀναντία.
||

§12 [ἄρχειν δὲ τῆς συν]θήκης, ὡς μὲν Μιλήσιοι ἄγουσιν, στεφανηφόρον θεὸν τὸν με-
90 [τ' Ἀπολλώνιον κ]αὶ μῆνα Πυανοψιῶνα καὶ ἕκτην ἐπὶ δέκα, ὡς δὲ Μάγνητες [ἄγουσιν, στεφαν]ηφόρον Ἀριστέα καὶ μῆνα Ἀγνεῶνα καὶ πέμπτη(ν) ἐπὶ δέκα. [δοῦναι δὲ τῶν συ]νθηκῶν ἀντίγραφον ἐσφραγισμένον τοῖς παρὰ Ῥοδίων [πρεσβευταῖς, ὅπ]ως διατηρῆται καὶ ἐν τῆι Ῥοδίων πόλει ἕως τοῦ ἀντιγρα-[φῆναι εἰς τὰς στή]λας.

5: Ἀ[γάθ]ω[νος]: Hiller von Gaertringen. || 8: Χέρ[σωνος]: Hiller von Gaertringen. || 12–13: the restoration [Καυ|ν]ίων is queried by Errington. || 34–35: ἐπέγνωσαν [ἐπὶ| το]ὺς τόπους: Robert. || 44: μήτε καθιερώσει: Mezger, Hiller von Gaertringen. || 47: ⟨ὁς⟩τισποτεοῦν: Hiller von Gaertringen. || 72–73: ἀναπέμ|[πειν δὲ τοῖς ἥκους]ιν πρε[σβευταῖς ξένια]: Hiller von Gaertringen. || 77–80: [κυρωθεισῶν δὲ] τῶν συνθηκῶν ο[ἱ μὲν πρέσβεις οἱ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Μαγνήτων| παραγενόμεν]οι εἰς Μίλητον ὁρκισάτ[ωσαν τὸν δῆμον τὸν Μιλησίων· οἱ δὲ| πρέσβεις οἱ ἀπες]ταλμένοι ἐπὶ τὴν σύνθεσι̣ν [παρὰ Μιλησίων ὁρκισάτωσαν| τὸν δῆμο]ν̣ τὸν Μαγνήτων: Mezger.

This treaty between Miletos and Magnesia on the Maiander (and extended to include their allies Herakleia and Priene) put an end to a war between the two states.[1] This war is undocumented elsewhere.[2] The agreement opens with a list of the states that sent ambassadors to arbitrate it. Thirteen states are named; three of them were members of the Achaian League, which is also mentioned. This is an unusually large number of states to be involved in an arbitration, although the total number of arbitrators was apparently only around forty or so.[3] Rhodes was clearly the prime mover among the arbitrators, and many of the states who worked with Rhodes here were dependent upon it or allied with it.[4]

1. On the interrelations between these states, cf. **100**, the arbitration between Priene and Miletos; **120**, the arbitration of Mylasa, one of the arbitrators here, between Priene and Magnesia; and **108**, the treaty between Herakleia and Miletos. An inscription from later in the second century (*IPriene* 51) records a treaty between Herakleia and Amyzon; perhaps Priene had acted in a mediatory capacity for its old enemy Herakleia.

2. These events have traditionally been dated to 196 B.C., but Errington (*Chiron* 19) has recently challenged this view, objecting to the basic *ex silentio* arguments of Mezger. Errington believes the later 180s provide a more reasonable political context for a war significant enough to involve these four states, but evidently fought and resolved without the participation of Antiochos. The leading role taken by the Rhodians is just as appropriate to the period after 188 as it is to the 190s.

3. Robert argued (*REG* 1925, pp. 33–34) that panels of judges from more than one city were unusual in international territorial arbitrations, and more likely to be found as foreign judges convened to hear litigation between citizens of the same city. But multinational tribunals in interstate arbitrations were not at all unprecedented; cf. **46**, **63**, **85**, **154**.

4. Cf. Livy 35.20. One of the Rhodian arbitrators, Nikostratos the son of Teisylos (line 6), also acted in the Rhodian arbitration between Samos and Priene about a decade earlier (**74** [*IPriene* 37], line 4). The Rhodian position as chief arbitrator is emphasized in sec. 12: Rhodes was to preserve a sealed copy of the treaty until such time as it was engraved.

Following the list of arbitrators and of representatives from the hostile states are the terms of the agreement between Miletos and Magnesia. First and most important, as the original cause of the war between them, was the question of the Peraia, the territory that both states claimed. This may well have been the district of Myos, an eternally disputed region.[5] The arbitrators in the 180s designated a new boundary for the Peraia, giving it as a whole to neither side. Rather they divided it and set the river Hybandos as the new border, with all the land upstream along the Maiander from the confluence of the Hybandos and the Maiander designated as a Magnesian possession, and the territory downstream to the sea as Milesian.[6] The arbitrators ordered that boundary markers be set up along the course of the river on the spots selected by them. These individuals may also have acted as a boundary commission, actually visiting the district in question; this would confirm the fact that the settling of the border dispute was their most important task (lines 34–36). An interesting point is that they took into account a possible change in the course of the river and attempted to ensure the perpetuity of the agreement by designating the present course as the boundary for all time (lines 36–37).

In order to make the settlement secure, detailed regulations were also set out forbidding either side to acquire territory belonging to the other. Various matters typical of peace treaties were also settled by the arbitrators, such as the restitution of goods and persons seized during the war, and the declaration of an amnesty. Magnesia had either a surplus of Milesian prisoners or else the possession of certain Milesian dignitaries;[7] at any rate, the fact that Magnesia clearly was in some sort of superior position as regards prisoners and the fact that it made it an act of grace to restore them freely (through the Rhodians) to Miletos suggest that Magnesia may have had the upper hand in the war.[8] If so, then perhaps the Rhodian alliance that arbitrated the peace was less "pro-Milesian" than Rehm believed. If Magnesia had come out of the war in a better position than Miletos, then it would have been under no necessity to concede to the judgement of arbitrators who unilaterally favoured its opponent.

5. Cf. Piccirilli 36. In 201 Philip transferred Myos from Miletos to Magnesia (Polyb. 16.24.9); this may be the "sacred land" that Manlius restored to Miletos in 188 (98; Polyb. 21.46).

6. ἕως θαλάσσης (line 32); cf. 41.

7. The interpretation depends on the translation of ὑπεράγοντας (lines 67–68); most translate the term to mean "surplus"; but see Burstein's interpretation.

8. Rehm, p. 348.

110. Appius Claudius mediates between Gortyn and Knossos (184)

Polybios 22.15.

Sonne 27; de Ruggiero, pp. 40, 65, 142, 155, 161–63, 205, 244–45; Berard 46; G. Cardinali, *RFC* 35 (1907) pp. 16f.; Phillipson, p. 156; Raeder 52; Muttelsee, pp. 52–53; M. van der Mijnsbrugge, *The Cretan Koinon* (New York, 1931) pp. 49–50; van Effenterre, pp. 145f., 262f.; R. F. Willetts, *Aristocratic Society in Ancient Crete* (London, 1955) p. 238; Larsen (Frank), pp. 287–88; Préaux, p. 279; R. F. Willetts, *Ancient Crete: A Social History* (London and Toronto, 1965) p. 155; Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 3, pp. 200–202; Gruen, pp. 106, 233f.; Ager, *JHS* 114 (1994) pp. 1–18.

Ὅτι κατὰ τὴν Κρήτην, κοσμοῦντος ἐν Γορτύνῃ Κύδα τοῦ Ἀντάλκους, κατὰ πάντα τρόπον ἐλαττούμενοι Γορτύνιοι τοὺς Κνωσίους, ἀποτεμόμενοι τῆς χώρας αὐτῶν τὸ μὲν καλούμενον Λυκάστιον προσένειμαν Ῥαυκίοις, τὸ (δὲ) Διατόνιον Λυττίοις. (2) κατὰ δὲ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον παραγενομένων πρεσβευτῶν ἐκ τῆς Ῥώμης εἰς τὴν Κρήτην τῶν περὶ τὸν Ἄππιον χάριν τοῦ διαλῦσαι τὰς ἐνεστώσας αὐτοῖς πρὸς ἀλλήλους διαφοράς, καὶ ποιησαμένων λόγους ὑπὲρ τούτων (ἐν) τῇ Κνωσίων καὶ Γορτυνίων, πεισθέντες οἱ Κρηταιεῖς ἐπέτρεψαν τὰ καθ' αὑτοὺς τοῖς περὶ τὸν Ἄππιον. (3) οἱ δὲ [πεισθέντες] Κνωσίοις μὲν ἀποκατέστησαν τὴν χώραν, Κυδωνιάταις δὲ προσέταξαν τοὺς μὲν ὁμήρους ἀπολαβεῖν, οὓς ἐγκατέλειπον δόντες τοῖς περὶ Χαρμίωνα πρότερον, τὴν δὲ Φαλάσαρναν ἀφεῖναι μηδὲν ἐξ αὐτῆς νοσφισαμένους. (4) περὶ δὲ τῶν κατὰ κοινοδίκιον συνεχώρησαν αὐτοῖς βουλομένοις μὲν [αὐτοῖς] ἐξεῖναι μετέχειν, (5) μὴ βουλομένοις δὲ καὶ τοῦτ' ἐξεῖναι, (6) πάσης ἀπεχομένοις τῆς ἄλλης Κρήτης αὐτοῖς τε καὶ τοῖς ἐκ Φαλασάρνης φυγάσιν.

Polybios records that a Roman commission headed by Appius Claudius Pulcher arrived in Crete in the summer of 184 in time to settle disputes between the two rivals Knossos and Gortyn.[1] At that time, Gortyn was taking the offensive in a campaign to weaken Knossos, though only a few years previously, when Labeo had tried to mediate on Crete, Knossos and Gortyn had been allies against Kydonia (**95**).[2] The Cretan states were apparently willing to listen to Appius's persuasion and entrusted their affairs to the arbitration of his commission. Gortyn acquiesced in the restoration of territory to Knossos, while Claudius also settled some issues concerning Kydonia and Phalasarna.[3] The

1. Appius Claudius Pulcher was becoming the Roman "expert" on Greek arbitration; cf. **111**.

2. See **127** and **128** for other arbitrations between the hostile states of Knossos and Gortyn.

3. See Cardinali, pp. 16f. (and Guarducci, *IC* II, pp. 111 and 219–20); van Effenterre, p. 263; and Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 3, p. 202, for hypotheses regarding the situation involving Kydonia and Phalasarna.

Romans informed the Kydonians that they could, if they wished, participate in "matters concerning κοινοδίκιον," but they did not have to, provided they did not interfere with the rest of Crete. This term, κοινοδίκιον, has arisen before in the context of a possible arbitration.[4] The sources that refer to it are very meagre and quite ambiguous; and we should be cautious about assuming that Polybios was referring to a particular well-established and well-known institution. The phrase in Polybios may have something to do with a commonalty of jurisdiction among the Cretan states, for those who desired; but it seems unlikely that it refers to something as tangible as a permanent federal tribunal (of the Cretan *koinon*) for interstate adjudication.[5] It is possible, though, that part of the mandate of the Roman arbitrators involved some provision for dealing with future disputes.[6]

111. Conflict between the Achaian League and Sparta (184/3)

I: Polybios 23.4.
II: Livy 39.48.2–4.
III: Pausanias 7.9.3–5.

Cf. Plutarch *Philopoimen* 16.6.

Sonne 138; Errington, *Philopoemen,* pp. 173f.; Shimron, pp. 107f.; Piper, pp. 126f.; Bastini, pp. 97f.; Cartledge/Spawforth, *Sparta*, pp. 81f. See also the works cited in **96**.

I: Polybios 23.4

Ἐπὶ δὲ τούτοις εἰσεκλήθησαν οἱ παρὰ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων πρέσβεις. (2) τούτων δ' ἦσαν διαφοραὶ τέτταρες. οἱ μὲν γὰρ περὶ Λῦκιν ἥκοντες ⟨ὑπὲρ⟩ τῶν ἀρχαίων φυγάδων ἐπρέσβευον, φάσκοντες δεῖν ἔχειν αὐτοὺς πάσας τὰς κτήσεις, ἀφ' ὧν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἔφυγον· (3) οἱ δὲ περὶ τὸν Ἀρέα καὶ τὸν Ἀλκιβιάδην, ἐφ' ᾧ ταλαντιαίαν λαβόντες κτῆσιν ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων τὰ λοιπὰ διαδοῦναι τοῖς ἀξίοις τῆς πολιτείας. (4) Σήριππος δ' ἐπρέσβευε περὶ τοῦ μένειν τὴν ὑποκειμένην κατάστασιν, ἣν ἔχοντές ποτε συνεπολιτεύοντο μετὰ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν. (5) ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν τεθνατωμένων καὶ τῶν ἐκπεπτωκότων κατὰ τὰ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν δόγματα παρῆσαν οἱ περὶ Χαίρωνα, κάθοδον αὑτοῖς ἀξιοῦντες συγχωρηθῆναι καὶ τὴν πολιτείαν ἀποκατασταθῆναι τοιαύτην, ... (6) ἐποιοῦντο πρὸς τοὺς Ἀχαιοὺς οἰκείους ταῖς ἰδίαις ὑποθέσεσι λόγους. (7) οὐ δυναμένη ⟨δὲ⟩ διευκρινεῖν ἡ

4. Case **67**, q.v. for some discussion. See Ager, *JHS* 114, for a more extensive examination of the term. The manuscripts of Polybios give the word as κοινοδίκαιον.

5. The view of Guarducci and others.

6. Probably private ones as opposed to public interstate quarrels of any magnitude. Cf. **67**, and see Ager, *JHS* 114.

Romans informed the Kydonians that they could, if they wished, participate in "matters concerning κοινοδίκιον," but they did not have to, provided they did not interfere with the rest of Crete. This term, κοινοδίκιον, has arisen before in the context of a possible arbitration.[4] The sources that refer to it are very meagre and quite ambiguous; and we should be cautious about assuming that Polybios was referring to a particular well-established and well-known institution. The phrase in Polybios may have something to do with a commonalty of jurisdiction among the Cretan states, for those who desired; but it seems unlikely that it refers to something as tangible as a permanent federal tribunal (of the Cretan *koinon*) for interstate adjudication.[5] It is possible, though, that part of the mandate of the Roman arbitrators involved some provision for dealing with future disputes.[6]

111. Conflict between the Achaian League and Sparta (184/3)

I: Polybios 23.4.
II: Livy 39.48.2–4.
III: Pausanias 7.9.3–5.

Cf. Plutarch *Philopoimen* 16.6.

Sonne 138; Errington, *Philopoemen,* pp. 173f.; Shimron, pp. 107f.; Piper, pp. 126f.; Bastini, pp. 97f.; Cartledge/Spawforth, *Sparta*, pp. 81f. See also the works cited in **96**.

I: Polybios 23.4

Ἐπὶ δὲ τούτοις εἰσεκλήθησαν οἱ παρὰ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων πρέσβεις. (2) τούτων δ' ἦσαν διαφοραὶ τέτταρες. οἱ μὲν γὰρ περὶ Λῦκιν ἥκοντες ⟨ὑπὲρ⟩ τῶν ἀρχαίων φυγάδων ἐπρέσβευον, φάσκοντες δεῖν ἔχειν αὐτοὺς πάσας τὰς κτήσεις, ἀφ' ὧν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἔφυγον· (3) οἱ δὲ περὶ τὸν Ἀρέα καὶ τὸν Ἀλκιβιάδην, ἐφ' ᾧ ταλαντιαίαν λαβόντες κτῆσιν ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων τὰ λοιπὰ διαδοῦναι τοῖς ἀξίοις τῆς πολιτείας. (4) Σήριππος δ' ἐπρέσβευε περὶ τοῦ μένειν τὴν ὑποκειμένην κατάστασιν, ἣν ἔχοντές ποτε συνεπολιτεύοντο μετὰ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν. (5) ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν τεθνατωμένων καὶ τῶν ἐκπεπτωκότων κατὰ τὰ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν δόγματα παρῆσαν οἱ περὶ Χαίρωνα, κάθοδον αὑτοῖς ἀξιοῦντες συγχωρηθῆναι καὶ τὴν πολιτείαν ἀποκατασταθῆναι τοιαύτην, ... (6) ἐποιοῦντο πρὸς τοὺς Ἀχαιοὺς οἰκείους ταῖς ἰδίαις ὑποθέσεσι λόγους. (7) οὐ δυναμένη ⟨δὲ⟩ διευκρινεῖν ἡ

4. Case **67**, q.v. for some discussion. See Ager, *JHS* 114, for a more extensive examination of the term. The manuscripts of Polybios give the word as κοινοδίκαιον.

5. The view of Guarducci and others.

6. Probably private ones as opposed to public interstate quarrels of any magnitude. Cf. **67**, and see Ager, *JHS* 114.

cύγκλητος τὰc κατὰ μέροc διαφοράc, προεχειρίcατο τρεῖc ἄνδραc τοὺc καὶ πρότερον ἤδη πεπρεcβευκότας περὶ τούτων εἰc τὴν Πελοπόννηcον· οὗτοι δ' ἦcαν Τίτοc, Κόιντοc Καικίλιοc, ⟨Ἄππιοc Κλαύδιοc⟩. (8) ἐφ' οἷc γενομένων λόγων πλειόνων, ὑπὲρ μὲν τοῦ καταπορεύεcθαι τοὺc πεφευγότας καὶ τεθανατωμένουc καὶ περὶ τοῦ μένειν τὴν πόλιν μετὰ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν ἐγένετο πᾶcι cύμφωνον, (9) περὶ δὲ τῶν κτήcεων, πότερον δεῖ τὸ τάλαντον εἰc ἑκάcτουc τοὺc φυγάδαc ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων ἐκλέξαcθαι ..., περὶ τούτων διημφιcβήτουν πρὸc ἀλλήλουc. (10) ἵνα δὲ μὴ πάλιν ἐξ ἀκεραίου περὶ πάντων ἀντιλέγοιεν, ἔγγραπτον ὑπὲρ τῶν ὁμολογουμένων ..., ἐφ' ὃ πάντεc ἐπέβαλοντο τὰc ἰδίαc cφραγῖδαc. (11) οἱ δὲ περὶ τὸν Τίτον βουλόμενοι καὶ τοὺc Ἀχαιοὺc εἰc τὴν ὁμολογίαν ἐμπλέξαι, προcεκαλέcαντο τοὺc περὶ Ξέναρχον. (12) οὗτοι γὰρ ἐπρέcβευον τότε παρὰ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν, ἅμα μὲν ἀνανεούμενοι τὴν cυμμαχίαν, ἅμα δὲ τῇ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων διαφορᾷ προcεδρεύοντεc. (13) καὶ παρὰ τὴν προcδοκίαν ἐρωτώμενοι περὶ τῶν γραφομένων, εἰ cυνευδοκοῦcιν, οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπωc εἰc ἀπορίαν ἐνέπεcον. (14) δυcηρεcτοῦντο μὲν γὰρ τῇ καθόδῳ τῶν φυγάδων καὶ τῶν τεθανατωμένων διὰ τὸ γίνεcθαι παρὰ τὰ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν δόγματα καὶ παρὰ τὴν cτήλην, εὐδοκοῦντο δὲ τοῖc ὅλοιc τῷ γράφεcθαι διότι ⟨δεῖ⟩ τὴν πόλιν τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων πολιτεύειν μετὰ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν. (15) καὶ πέραc τὰ μὲν ἀπορούμενοι, τὰ δὲ καταπληττόμενοι τοὺc ἄνδραc, ἐπεβάλοντο τὴν cφραγῖδα.

II: Livy 39.48.2–4

Lacedaemonii deinde introducti sunt. multae et parvae disceptationes iactabantur; sed quae maxime rem continerent, erant utrum restituerentur quos Achaei damnaverant necne; (3) inique an iure occidissent quos occiderant, et utrum manerent in Achaico concilio Lacedaemonii an, ut ante fuerat, secretum eius unius in Peloponneso civitatis ius esset. (4) restitui iudiciaque facta tolli placuit, Lacedaemonem manere in Achaico concilio scribique id decretum et consignari a Lacedaemoniis et Achaeis.

III: Pausanias 7.9.3–5

Ῥωμαίων δὲ ἡ βουλὴ πέμπουcιν ἄλλουc τε ἄνδραc καὶ Ἄππιον Λακεδαιμονίοιc καὶ Ἀχαιοῖc τὰ δίκαια ὁρίcαι. Ἄππιοc δὲ καὶ οἱ cὺν αὐτῷ ἔμελλον μὲν οὐδὲ ὀφθέντεc Ἀχαιοῖc ἔcεcθαι καθ' ἡδονήν, οἳ Ἀρέα καὶ Ἀλκιβιάδαν ἅμ' αὐτοῖc ἐπήγοντο ἐν τῷ τότε Ἀχαιοῖc ἐχθίcτουc· ἐλύπηcαν δὲ καὶ ἐc πλέον τοὺc Ἀχαιούc, ἐπειδὴ ἐc τὸν cύλλογον αὐτῶν ἐπελθόντεc cὺν ὀργῇ μᾶλλον ἐποιοῦντο ἢ πειθοῖ τοὺc λόγουc. (4) Λυκόρτας δὲ ὁ Μεγαλοπολίτηc, οὔτε ἀξιώματι οὐδενὸc Ἀρκάδων ὕcτεροc καί τι καὶ φρόνημα κατὰ φιλίαν προcειληφὼc τὴν Φιλοποίμενοc, λόγῳ τε ἀπέφαινε τὰ ὑπὲρ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν δίκαια καὶ ὁμοῦ τοῖc λόγοιc καὶ μέμψιν τινὰ ὑπέτεινεν ἐc τοὺc Ῥωμαίουc. Ἄππιοc δὲ καὶ οἱ cὺν αὐτῷ Λυκόρταν λέγοντα ἐποιοῦντο ἐν χλευαcμῷ καὶ Ἀρέωc ἀποψηφίζονται καὶ Ἀλκιβιάδα μηδὲν ἀδίκημα ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐc Ἀχαιοὺc εἶναι, Λακεδαιμονίοιc τε ἀποcτεῖλαι πρέcβειc ἐφιᾶcιν ἐc Ῥώμην, ἐναντία ἐφιέντεc ἢ Ῥωμαίοιc cυγκείμενα ἦν καὶ Ἀχαιοῖc· Ἀχαιῶν μὲν γὰρ εἴρητο ἀπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ παρὰ

τὴν Ῥωμαίων βουλὴν ἀπιέναι πρέσβεις, ἰδίᾳ δὲ ἀπείρητο μὴ πρεσβεύεσθαι τὰς πόλεις ὅσαι συνεδρίου τοῦ Ἀχαιῶν μετεῖχον. (5) ἀντιπρεσβευσαμένων δὲ καὶ Ἀχαιῶν Λακεδαιμονίοις καὶ λόγων ῥηθέντων ὑπὸ ἀμφοτέρων ἐπὶ τῆς βουλῆς, τοὺς αὐτοὺς ἀποστέλλουσιν αὖθις οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι Λακεδαιμονίοις γενέσθαι καὶ Ἀχαιοῖς δικαστάς, Ἄππιον καὶ ὅσοι σὺν ἐκείνῳ πρότερον ἐς τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἀφίκοντο. οἱ δὲ τούς τε ἐκβληθέντας ὑπὸ Ἀχαιῶν κατάγουσιν ἐς Σπάρτην καὶ ὅσων πρὸ κρίσεως ἀπελθόντων κατέγνωστο ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν ἀδικεῖν, καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τούτοις τιμήματα ἔλυσαν· καὶ συντελείας μὲν Λακεδαιμονίους τῆς ἐς τὸ Ἀχαϊκὸν οὐκ ἀφιᾶσι, περὶ δὲ τῇ ἑκάστου ψυχῇ ξενικά σφισι διδόασιν εἶναι δικαστήρια, ὅσα δὲ ἄλλα ἐγκλήματα, λαμβάνειν τε αὐτοὺς καὶ ἐν τῷ Ἀχαϊκῷ ὑπέχειν τὰς κρίσεις.

The ambiguous and indifferent Roman decision of 188 and the brutal repression by Philopoimen that followed it were not conducive to Sparta's remaining a compliant member of the Achaian League.[1] The Spartans considered that their independence had been to some extent endorsed by that Roman judgement; furthermore, when a Spartan embassy complained to Rome of Philopoimen's massacre at Kompasion, the consul M. Lepidus officially condemned the Achaian actions (Polyb. 22.2–3). But matters appear to have remained relatively unchanged until the summer of 185 when Q. Caecilius Metellus was in Greece and Macedonia investigating complaints against Philip V.[2] Perhaps in order to enhance his own prestige as a mediator, Metellus met in an ex officio capacity with the magistrates of the Achaian League at Argos, where he remonstrated with them concerning their conduct towards the Spartans and urged them to change their ways. The criticism acted as a springboard for the expression of various differences of policy towards Rome within the League. Tensions between Rome and Achaia in the second century were frequently provoked by the Spartan situation; but the heart of the matter was divided Achaian opinion on whether to pursue a course of active friendship and cooperation with Rome or whether to insist on rejection of Roman pressures, real or perceived, at every turn. The Achaian response to Metellus in 185, refusing to allow him to convoke a meeting of the League, was the work of the faction favouring a determined display of Achaian independence.

Both Achaians and Spartans were present in Rome in the winter of 185/4 to discuss the Spartan question. The issue was still the settlement imposed on Sparta by Philopoimen, an arrangement that the Achaians claimed was the best possible; the Spartans argued the opposite. Clearly the senate could not come close to making an equitable judgement between two such subjective views without further information. It therefore indulged its traditional reluctance to make a firm decision on Greek affairs and added an investigation into the

1. See **96**.
2. See **106**.

Spartan problem to the tasks of the new commission to be sent to Macedon under Appius Claudius (Polyb. 22.12).

Appius Claudius has been termed an "arbitration expert" for the work he carried out among the Greek states.[3] But the tone he took with the Achaians in 184 leads one to query his expertise in diplomacy and mediation. When he arrived at Kleitor for his meeting with the Achaian assembly, he was accompanied by the prominent Spartans Areus and Alkibiades, whom the Achaians had condemned to death. The clear expression of Roman support for Sparta's case frightened the Achaians, and so did the bullying response Appius gave to the Achaian self-defense. Pausanias states that Appius was sent out to perform an actual arbitration between Sparta and Achaia; but Appius was clearly acting as the champion of Sparta, with no interest in listening to Achaian appeals.[4] His response, perhaps prompted by personal concern for his own *dignitas*,[5] was to threaten the Achaians until, cowed by his threats, they rescinded the decrees of execution promulgated against Areus and Alkibiades, and agreed to Roman demands.

Both sides sent embassies to the senate in the winter of 184/3 in order to settle the matter, and evidently there was by now a great deal to be settled. Polybios records that no less than four different sets of Spartan envoys were present, representative of the various political divisions within the state and among its exiles. Faced with this morass of conflicting claims and arguments, the senate finally appointed an arbitration commission to deal with them, a more vigorous effort on the part of the Romans than had been made in 188. The tribunal consisted of three men with previous experience in the issues of the Peloponnese: Flamininus, Metellus, and Appius Claudius. It carried out its task in Rome, and presumably the embassies of the Achaians and Spartans presented their claims to the commission to be arbitrated.[6] The commission managed to come to an agreement on the matter of the exiles, who were to be restored to Sparta. They also argued that Sparta should remain a part of the Achaian League.[7] Condemnations and penalties voted against anti-Achaian exiles were revoked and remitted. Machinery was set up to avoid future violent disputes, at least over certain matters, since all cases that involved a capital charge were to be referred to foreign courts, ξενικὰ δικαστήρια. The issue of the restoration of property, however, continued to be a problem; the commissioners differed over which of the solutions suggested by the various Spartan embassies should be employed, and apparently no settlement was reached.

3. Cf. **110**, and see Préaux, p. 279.

4. Cf. Paus. 7.9.6.

5. Gruen, p. 488.

6. Pausanias mistakenly confuses the work of this commission with the visit of Appius to Greece in the summer of 184.

7. On the compromise solution, see Piper, p. 128; Errington, *Philopoemen*, pp. 182–83.

The arbitration commission of Flamininus, Metellus, and Appius was probably the most energetic reaction the Greek states ever succeeded in eliciting from the senate in the years of dispute between Achaia and Sparta. But the Achaian League was clearly not moved by a desire for neutral arbitration by a third party. The Achaians came to Rome because they were under attack by Sparta (which they perceived to have Rome's favour) and were required to defend themselves. The nationalists of the Achaian League did not believe that any of this was Rome's business, arguing that it had no right to arbitrate in a dispute between the League and one of its members. They bowed to the force of circumstance, but the affair of Sparta and the Roman interference (in Achaian eyes) and the Achaian recalcitrance (in Roman eyes) continued to be a chief source of aggravation in Roman-Achaian relations.

112. Flamininus attempts to mediate between Eumenes II and Prousias I (183)

I: Justin 32.4.8.
II: Livy 39.51.1.
III: Polybios 23.5.1.
IV: Appian *Syriaca* 11.
V: Plutarch *Flamininus* 20.5.

Cf. Zonaras 9.21.

C. Habicht, *Hermes* 84 (1956) pp. 90f.; McShane, pp. 158f.; Hansen[2], pp. 97f.; J. Briscoe, *Latomus* 31 (1972) pp. 23–24; Hopp, pp. 41–42; Will, vol. 2, pp. 286–87; Sherwin-White, p. 27.

I: Justin 32.4.8

Quae ubi Romam nuntiata sunt, missi a senatu legati sunt, qui utrumque regem in pacem cogerent Hannibalemque deposcerent.

II: Livy 39.51.1

Ad Prusiam regem legatus T. Quinctius Flamininus venit, quem suspectum Romanis et receptus post fugam Antiochi Hannibal et bellum adversus Eumenem motum faciebat.

III: Polybios 23.5.1

Ὅτι Δεινοκράτης ὁ Μεσσήνιος παραγενόμενος εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην πρεσβευτὴς καὶ καταλαβὼν τὸν Τίτον πρεσβευτὴν καθεσταμένον ὑπὸ τῆς συγκλήτου πρός τε Προυσίαν καὶ τὸν Σέλευκον ...

The arbitration commission of Flamininus, Metellus, and Appius was probably the most energetic reaction the Greek states ever succeeded in eliciting from the senate in the years of dispute between Achaia and Sparta. But the Achaian League was clearly not moved by a desire for neutral arbitration by a third party. The Achaians came to Rome because they were under attack by Sparta (which they perceived to have Rome's favour) and were required to defend themselves. The nationalists of the Achaian League did not believe that any of this was Rome's business, arguing that it had no right to arbitrate in a dispute between the League and one of its members. They bowed to the force of circumstance, but the affair of Sparta and the Roman interference (in Achaian eyes) and the Achaian recalcitrance (in Roman eyes) continued to be a chief source of aggravation in Roman-Achaian relations.

112. Flamininus attempts to mediate between Eumenes II and Prousias I (183)

I: Justin 32.4.8.
II: Livy 39.51.1.
III: Polybios 23.5.1.
IV: Appian *Syriaca* 11.
V: Plutarch *Flamininus* 20.5.

Cf. Zonaras 9.21.

C. Habicht, *Hermes* 84 (1956) pp. 90f.; McShane, pp. 158f.; Hansen[2], pp. 97f.; J. Briscoe, *Latomus* 31 (1972) pp. 23–24; Hopp, pp. 41–42; Will, vol. 2, pp. 286–87; Sherwin-White, p. 27.

I: Justin 32.4.8

Quae ubi Romam nuntiata sunt, missi a senatu legati sunt, qui utrumque regem in pacem cogerent Hannibalemque deposcerent.

II: Livy 39.51.1

Ad Prusiam regem legatus T. Quinctius Flamininus venit, quem suspectum Romanis et receptus post fugam Antiochi Hannibal et bellum adversus Eumenem motum faciebat.

III: Polybios 23.5.1

Ὅτι Δεινοκράτης ὁ Μεσσήνιος παραγενόμενος εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην πρεσβευτὴς καὶ καταλαβὼν τὸν Τίτον πρεσβευτὴν καθεσταμένον ὑπὸ τῆς συγκλήτου πρός τε Προυσίαν καὶ τὸν Σέλευκον ...

IV: Appian *Syriaca* 11

Φλαμινῖνος, ... ἡττηθέντος γὰρ ὕστερον Ἀντιόχου φεύγοντα τὸν Ἀννίβαν καὶ ἀλώμενον περὶ Βιθυνίαν, πρεσβεύων, ἐφ' ἕτερα πρὸς Προυσίαν ....

V: Plutarch *Flamininus* 20.5

Τίτος δὲ πρεσβευτὴς δι' ἑτέρας δή τινας πράξεις ὑπὸ τῆς βουλῆς πρὸς τὸν Προυσίαν ἀφικόμενος ...

One of the threats faced by Pergamon in the years after Apameia was the kingdom of Bithynia to the northeast. Prousias I began to carry out certain aggressions, probably in 186, capturing Kieros and Tios, and encroaching on the territory of the independent Greek state of Herakleia on the Black Sea coast. He also refused to evacuate a certain territory that had been granted to Eumenes by the settlement of Apameia. Eumenes therefore invaded Bithynia, and Prousias responded by forming an anti-Pergamene coalition. The Galatian Ortiagon supported Prousias, as did the fugitive Hannibal, who commanded the Bithynian fleet. Bithynia also received help from Philip of Macedon. Little is known of the war itself, as the sources are very fragmentary and references scattered.[1] But it appears that Rome was requested or intended to play a part in reconciling the two kings. An embassy under Flamininus was sent out, probably in the summer of 183, with a view to putting an end to the war.[2] But an independent epigraphic source indicates that the Roman attempt to mediate had no real effect. An inscription discovered on Rhodes speaks of the victory of Eumenes and the Pergamene forces over those of Prousias and Ortiagon and the Galatians.[3] The fact that Prousias accepted terms less than favourable to himself suggests that he had suffered a decisive military defeat.[4] Thus it seems that any Roman mediation in this case was ultimately irrelevant.

1. See Nep. *Hannibal* 10–11; Livy 39.46; Polyb. 23.1f.; Justin 32.4.

2. See Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 3, p. 221. The other purpose of this embassy, a purpose that the literary sources tend to emphasize, was to force Prousias to relinquish Hannibal to the Romans.

3. See M. Segre, *RFC* 60 (1932) pp. 446–52, no. 1.

4. Strabo (C 564) says that Prousias was required to withdraw from Hellespontine Phrygia as a result of his agreement with Eumenes. Cf. *IPergamon* 225.

113. Roman representatives intervene between the Achaian League and Messene (183)

Polybios 24.9.12–13.

Roebuck, Diss., pp. 95f.; Errington, *Philopoemen,* pp. 154f., 183f.; Bastini, pp. 106f.

> Πρῴην μὲν γὰρ ἐν τοῖς Μεσσηνιακοῖς πολλὰ ποιήσαντος Κοΐντου Μαρκίου πρὸς τὸ μηδὲν τοὺς Ἀχαιοὺς βουλεύσασθαι περὶ Μεσσηνίων ἄνευ τῆς Ῥωμαίων προαιρέσεως, (13) παρακούσαντας καὶ ψηφισαμένους αὐτοὺς τὸν πόλεμον οὐ μόνον τὴν χώραν αὐτῶν καταφθεῖραι πᾶσαν ἀδίκως, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ἐπιφανεστάτους τῶν πολιτῶν οὓς μὲν φυγαδεῦσαι, τινὰς δ' αὐτῶν ἐκδότους λαβόντας αἰκισαμένους πᾶσαν αἰκίαν ἀποκτεῖναι, διότι προεκαλοῦντο περὶ τῶν ἀμφισβητουμένων ἐπὶ Ῥωμαίους.

When Flamininus arranged to arbitrate any disputes that might arise between Messene and the Achaian League, he had in view only problems rising from his immediate settlements, and only those problems that could be dealt with quickly and personally.[1] There was no provision for permanent arbitration, which is not surprising, as Messene was to join a federation, and it would be unusual to find provision for external arbitration between a *koinon* and a member state.[2] Nevertheless, Messene, inspired perhaps by Flamininus's offer in 191, continued to hold out the idea of referring its problems with the League to Roman arbitration. Philopoimen had allegedly "interfered" with Flamininus's settlement in some unknown way, perhaps by 190/89.[3] It may be that the Achaian intervention and undermining of the Roman edict had to do with internal matters in Messene such as the restoration of exiles and the inevitable property disputes. Perhaps it was a general attempt to revise the contract between Messene and the League itself to give Achaia greater control.[4]

In any case, the evidence is clear that Messene's first years in the Achaian League were not happy ones. In the winter of 184/3 the Messenian Deinokrates arrived in Rome just after Flamininus had been appointed as legate to Prousias of Bithynia (**112**). Deinokrates wanted Flamininus to stop off in Greece and

1. Cf. **86**.

2. This is not to say, of course, that such an arbitration was inconceivable. Cf. **137**, apparently an arbitration between Sparta and the Achaian League at a time when Sparta was *not* disputing its membership (though whether this arbitration was referred to a state or states outside the League entirely is another matter). It should also be recalled that the 184 settlement between Sparta and the Achaian League (**111**) provided for the use of ξενικὰ δικαστήρια in certain circumstances.

3. Polyb. 22.10. See Roebuck, Diss., pp. 94–95. Errington (*Philopoemen,* p. 155) argues for a date after spring 188.

4. See Roebuck, p. 95; Errington, pp. 155f.

retrieve Messene from its difficult situation with the Achaian League. Perhaps Flamininus could even be persuaded to take up the task of arbitration that he had offered before, though Deinokrates was probably less interested in having Flamininus as a neutral arbitrator than in having the Roman's backing in a bid for Messenian independence.[5] But however agreeable Flamininus may have been, the senate was, at least on this occasion, cognizant of the delicacy of the situation: they would not offer official Roman arbitration between the League and a member well-nigh in revolt, when the League had not requested it. Accordingly, Philopoimen, when Flamininus arrived, probably in the early summer of 183, was able to deny him a special meeting of the League on the grounds that he was only a private individual without a senatorial commission.

When Q. Marcius Philippus, the Roman legate investigating affairs in Greece and Macedon later in 183, was in the Peloponnese, the Messenians suggested a solution to the problem. Flamininus had failed to arbitrate, but Philippus was an official representative of the senate in Greece; it was only reasonable to suggest that he might perform that task for them now. It seemed even more reasonable to the Messenians when Philippus tried to restrain the Achaians from making war on them. He was quite willing to urge the Achaians to turn to Rome to arbitrate the dispute. The Achaian League, however, maintained its right to deal with its member without Roman interference and went to war with the rebellious Messene (Polyb. 24.9).

114. Roman mediation in the war between Eumenes II and Pharnakes (183–180)

I: Polybios 23.9.1 and 3.
II: Livy 40.2.6 and 8.
III: Polybios 24.1.1–3.
IV: Livy 40.20.1.
V: Polybios 24.5.3 and 7.
VI: Polybios 24.14.1–3 and 10.
VII: Polybios 24.15.1–12.
VIII: Diodoros 29.22.2.

McShane, pp. 161f.; Hansen[2], pp. 101f.; Hopp, pp. 44–48; Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 3, pp. 254, 267f.; Will, vol. 2, pp. 288–90; Sherwin-White, pp. 28, 42.

5. See Errington, p. 183.

retrieve Messene from its difficult situation with the Achaian League. Perhaps Flamininus could even be persuaded to take up the task of arbitration that he had offered before, though Deinokrates was probably less interested in having Flamininus as a neutral arbitrator than in having the Roman's backing in a bid for Messenian independence.[5] But however agreeable Flamininus may have been, the senate was, at least on this occasion, cognizant of the delicacy of the situation: they would not offer official Roman arbitration between the League and a member well-nigh in revolt, when the League had not requested it. Accordingly, Philopoimen, when Flamininus arrived, probably in the early summer of 183, was able to deny him a special meeting of the League on the grounds that he was only a private individual without a senatorial commission.

When Q. Marcius Philippus, the Roman legate investigating affairs in Greece and Macedon later in 183, was in the Peloponnese, the Messenians suggested a solution to the problem. Flamininus had failed to arbitrate, but Philippus was an official representative of the senate in Greece; it was only reasonable to suggest that he might perform that task for them now. It seemed even more reasonable to the Messenians when Philippus tried to restrain the Achaians from making war on them. He was quite willing to urge the Achaians to turn to Rome to arbitrate the dispute. The Achaian League, however, maintained its right to deal with its member without Roman interference and went to war with the rebellious Messene (Polyb. 24.9).

114. Roman mediation in the war between Eumenes II and Pharnakes (183–180)

I: Polybios 23.9.1 and 3.
II: Livy 40.2.6 and 8.
III: Polybios 24.1.1–3.
IV: Livy 40.20.1.
V: Polybios 24.5.3 and 7.
VI: Polybios 24.14.1–3 and 10.
VII: Polybios 24.15.1–12.
VIII: Diodoros 29.22.2.

McShane, pp. 161f.; Hansen[2], pp. 101f.; Hopp, pp. 44–48; Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 3, pp. 254, 267f.; Will, vol. 2, pp. 288–90; Sherwin-White, pp. 28, 42.

5. See Errington, p. 183.

I: Polybios 23.9.1 and 3

Ὅτι κατὰ τὸ δεύτερον ἔτος ἡ σύγκλητος, παραγενομένων πρέσβεων παρ' Εὐμένους καὶ Φαρνάκου ⟨καὶ Φιλίππου⟩ καὶ παρὰ τοῦ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν ἔθνους, ἔτι δὲ παρὰ τῶν ἐκ τῆς Λακεδαίμονος ἐκπεπτωκότων καὶ παρὰ τῶν κατεχόντων τὴν πόλιν, ἐχρημάτισε τούτοις.... (3) τούτοις μὲν οὖν καὶ τοῖς παρ' Εὐμένους καὶ Φαρνάκου πρεσβεύουσιν ἡ σύγκλητος ἀπεκρίθη διότι πέμψει πρεσβευτὰς τοὺς ἐπισκεψομένους περί τε Σινωπέων καὶ περὶ τῶν τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν ἀμφισβητουμένων.

II: Livy 40.2.6 and 8

Legationes deinde transmarinae in senatum introductae sunt, primae Eumenis et Pharnacis regum et Rhodiorum querentium de Sinopensium clade.... (8) Asiae regibus ac Rhodiis responsum est legatos ad eas res visendas senatum missurum.

III: Polybios 24.1.1–3

Εἰς δὲ τὴν Ῥώμην παραγεγονότων τῶν πρεσβευτῶν παρά τε τῶν ⟨Λακεδαιμονίων καὶ τῶν⟩ ἐκ Λακεδαίμονος φυγάδων, ⟨ἔτι δὲ⟩ παρὰ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν, ἅμα δὲ καὶ τῶν παρ' Εὐμένους καὶ παρ' Ἀριαράθου τοῦ βασιλέως ἡκόντων καὶ τῶν παρὰ Φαρνάκου, τούτοις πρῶτον ἐχρημάτισεν ἡ σύγκλητος. (2) βραχεῖ δὲ χρόνῳ πρότερον ἀνηγγελκότων τῶν περὶ τὸν Μάρκον πρεσβευτῶν, οὓς ἀπεστάλκεισαν ἐπὶ τὸν Εὐμένει καὶ Φαρνάκῃ συνεστηκότα πόλεμον, (3) καὶ διαπεσαφηκότων περί τε τῆς Εὐμένους μετριότητος ἐν πᾶσιν καὶ περὶ τῆς Φαρνάκου πλεονεξίας καὶ καθόλου τῆς ὑπερηφανίας, οὐκέτι πολλῶν προσεδεήθη λόγων ἡ σύγκλητος διακούσασα τῶν παραγεγονότων, ἀπεκρίθη δὲ διότι πάλιν πέμψει πρεσβευτὰς τοὺς φιλοτιμότερον ἐπισκεψομένους ὑπὲρ τῶν διαφερόντων ⟨τοῖς⟩ προειρημένοις.

IV: Livy 40.20.1

Legationes deinde in senatum introduxerunt, regum primas Eumenis et Ariarathis Cappadocis et Pharnacis Pontici. nec ultra quicquam eis responsum est quam missuros qui de controversiis eorum cognoscerent statuerentque.

V: Polybios 24.5.3 and 7

[Ὁ Εὐμένης] προέθετο πέμπειν τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς ἅπαντας εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην, ἅμα μὲν ἐλπίζων πέρας ἐπιθήσειν τῷ πρὸς τὸν Φαρνάκην πολέμῳ διὰ τῆς τούτων πρεσβείας.... (7) οἱ δὲ περὶ τὸν Ἄτταλον εἰσελθόντες εἰς τὴν σύγκλητον τά τε προϋπάρχοντα φιλάνθρωπα διὰ πλειόνων λόγων ἀνενεώσαντο καὶ τοῦ Φαρνάκου κατηγορήσαντες παρεκάλουν ἐπιστροφήν τινα ποιήσασθαι, δί ἧς τεύξεται τῆς ἁρμοζούσης δίκης. ἡ δὲ σύγκλητος διακούσασα φιλανθρώπως ἀπεκρίθη διότι πέμψει πρεσβευτὰς τοὺς κατὰ πάντα τρόπον λύσοντας τὸν πόλεμον.

VI: Polybios 24.14.1–3 and 10

Ὅτι κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν Φαρνάκης ὁ βασιλεύς, πάλιν ὀλιγωρήσας τῆς γεγενημένης ἐπὶ Ῥωμαίους ἀναφορᾶς, Λεώκριτον μὲν ἔτι κατὰ χειμῶνα μετὰ μυρίων στρατιωτῶν ἐξαπέστειλε πορθήσοντα τὴν Γαλατίαν, (2) αὐτὸς δὲ τῆς ἐαρινῆς ὥρας ὑποφαινούσης ἤθροιζε τὰς δυνάμεις, ὡς ἐμβαλῶν εἰς τὴν Καππαδοκίαν. (3) ἃ πυνθανόμενος Εὐμένης δυσχερῶς μὲν ἔφερε τὸ συμβαῖνον διὰ τὸ πάντας τοὺς τῆς πίστεως ὅρους ὑπερβαίνειν τὸν Φαρνάκην, ἠναγκάζετο δὲ τὸ παραπλήσιον ποιεῖν. . . . (10) ἄρτι δὲ κατεστρατοπεδευκότων αὐτῶν προσέπεσε παραγενέσθαι τοὺς ἐκ τῆς Ῥώμης πρεσβευτὰς ἐπὶ τὰς διαλύσεις.

VII: Polybios 24.15.1–12

Παραγενομένων δὲ τῶν πρέσβεων καὶ παρακαλούντων λύειν τὸν πόλεμον ἔφασαν μὲν οἱ περὶ τὸν Εὐμένη καὶ τὸν Ἀριαράθην ἕτοιμοι πρὸς πᾶν εἶναι τὸ παρακαλούμενον, (2) ἠξίουν δὲ τοὺς Ῥωμαίους, εἰ μέν ἐστι δυνατόν, ⟨εἰς⟩ σύλλογον αὐτοὺς συναγαγεῖν πρὸς τὸν Φαρνάκην, ἵνα κατὰ πρόσωπον λεγομένων τῶν λόγων ἴδωσι τὴν ἀθεσίαν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν ὠμότητα διὰ πλειόνων· (3) εἰ δὲ μὴ τοῦτ' εἴη δυνατόν, αὐτοὺς γενέσθαι κριτὰς τῶν πραγμάτων ἴσους καὶ δικαίους. (4) τῶν δὲ πρεσβευτῶν ἀναδεχομένων πάντα τὰ δυνατὰ καὶ καλῶς ἔχοντα ποιήσειν, ἀξιούντων δὲ τὴν στρατιὰν ἀπάγειν ἐκ τῆς χώρας· (5) ἄτοπον γὰρ εἶναι παρόντων ⟨πρέσβεων⟩ καὶ λόγους ποιουμένων ὑπὲρ διαλύσεων, ἅμα παρεῖναι τὰ τοῦ πολέμου καὶ κακοποιεῖν ἀλλήλους· (6) συνεχώρησαν οἱ περὶ τὸν Εὐμένη, καὶ τῇ κατὰ πόδας εὐθέως ἀναζεύξαντες οὗτοι προῆγον ὡς ἐπὶ Γαλατίας. (7) οἱ δὲ Ῥωμαῖοι πρὸς τὸν Φαρνάκην συμμίξαντες πρῶτον μὲν ἠξίουν αὐτὸν εἰς λόγους ἐλθεῖν τοῖς περὶ τὸν Εὐμένη· μάλιστα γὰρ ἂν οὕτω τυχεῖν τὰ πράγματα διεξαγωγῆς. (8) τοῦ δὲ πρὸς τοῦτο τὸ μέρος ἀντιβαίνοντος καὶ τέλος ἀπειπαμένου, δῆλον μὲν εὐθέως ἦν τοῦτο καὶ Ῥωμαίοις ὅτι καταγινώσκει προφανῶς ἑαυτοῦ καὶ διαπιστεῖ τοῖς σφετέροις πράγμασι· (9) πάντῃ δὲ πάντως βουλόμενοι λῦσαι τὸν πόλεμον προσεκαρτέρουν, ἕως οὗ συνεχώρησε πέμψειν αὐτοκράτορας ἐπὶ ⟨τὸν Πέργαμον κατὰ⟩ θάλατταν τοὺς συνθησομένους τὴν εἰρήνην, ἐφ' οἷς ἂν οἱ πρεσβευταὶ κελεύσωσιν. (10) ἀφικομένων ⟨δὲ⟩ τῶν πρέσβεων, καὶ συνελθόντων ὁμοῦ τῶν τε Ῥωμαίων καὶ τῶν περὶ Εὐμένη, καὶ τούτων μὲν εἰς ἅπαν ἑτοίμως συγκαταβαινόντων χάριν τοῦ συντελεσθῆναι τὴν εἰρήνην, (11) τῶν δὲ παρὰ τοῦ Φαρνάκου πρὸς πᾶν διαφερομένων καὶ τοῖς ὁμολογηθεῖσιν οὐκ ἐμμενόντων, ἀλλ' αἰεί τι προσεπιζητούντων καὶ μεταμελομένων, ταχέως τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις ἐγένετο δῆλον ὅτι ματαιοπονοῦσιν. οὐ γὰρ οἷός τ' ἦν συγκαταβαίνειν ὁ Φαρνάκης εἰς τὰς διαλύσεις. (12) ὅθεν ἀπράκτου γενομένης τῆς κοινολογίας, καὶ τῶν Ῥωμαίων ἀπαλλαγέντων ἐκ τοῦ Περγάμου, καὶ τῶν παρὰ τοῦ Φαρνάκου πρέσβεων ἀπολυθέντων εἰς τὴν οἰκείαν, ὁ μὲν πόλεμος ἐγεγένητο κατάμονος, οἱ δὲ περὶ τὸν Εὐμένη πάλιν ἐγίνοντο περὶ τὰς εἰς τοῦτον παρασκευάς.

VIII: Diodoros 29.22.2

Ἀπεφήνατο γὰρ ἀποστελεῖν ἐκ τοῦ συνεδρίου πρέσβεις τοὺς ἐκ παντὸς τρόπου συλλύσοντας τὸν πρὸς Φαρνάκην πόλεμον.

Pergamon's position as the most significant of the Asia Minor kingdoms in the 180s was not unrivalled. War with Bithynia (**112**) was succeeded by a struggle with Pharnakes of Pontos. Perhaps in an initial effort to avoid the strain of battling Pharnakes himself, Eumenes mounted yet another of his many embassies to Rome in the winter of 183/2. But the Romans had no more intention now than they had had during the Bithynian conflict of providing either side with military support. Pharnakes had also sent an embassy to Rome in the winter of 183/2, and the senate was willing at least to appear to listen to both sides impartially. As usual, however, they had no wish to commit themselves irrevocably to a particular stance on Eastern affairs and temporized by dispatching a commission to investigate. The senate was always much more willing to send an investigative than an arbitral commission. This particular commission, under a certain unidentified Marcus, did return with a definite opinion on the nature of the claims of both sides: Pharnakes was being greedy and aggressive, while Eumenes' claims were just and moderate.

In reference to the winter of 182/1, when more Eastern embassies came to Rome, Polybios could now speak of the "war" between the kings.[1] Eumenes, Ariarathes, and Pharnakes were all represented this time, and the senate had already had the report of the commission. Nevertheless, it delivered no decision and offered no censure of Pharnakes' conduct. The senate once again had no apparent desire to commit itself. More legates were sent to Asia, this time to investigate the conflict "more zealously."[2] In 181, Eumenes' brother, Attalos, had apparently succeeded in concluding a truce with Pharnakes.[3] There is no explicit reference to it in Polybios, but the truce may have been the result of Roman mediation by the commission sent out after the winter of 182/1.[4] While the truce was still in effect, Eumenes tried again to force Rome to take a stand in the East. Conscious of Attalos's popularity at Rome, he sent his three brothers, Attalos, Athenaios, and Philetairos, to Rome in the winter of 181/0. Eumenes hoped both to counter any personal cooling towards him in Rome and to put an end to the war with Pharnakes. Although Eumenes' stated desire in Polybios was to put an end to the war, which could be achieved by Roman mediation,

1. Polyb. 24.1.2: τὸν Εὐμένει καὶ Φαρνάκῃ συνεστηκότα πόλεμον. Previously it had been a matter of "disagreements" (τῶν τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν ἀμφισβητουμένων, Polyb. 23.9.3).

2. φιλοτιμότερον (Polyb. 24.1.3). Walbank (*Comm*, vol. 3, p. 254) suggests that the senate, no longer favouring Eumenes as much as formerly, may have been critical of Marcus's report, which *did* favour the Pergamene king.

3. Mistakenly called a treaty by Polybios, or more probably by his excerptor.

4. Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 3, p. 257.

Attalos, in the absence of a Pontic counterembassy, made accusations against Pharnakes and asked for the Romans to punish him. Attalos was clearly asking for military support, which the Romans just as clearly did not wish to send. Rather they sent yet another commission, this time to put an end to the war.

When the legates arrived, the truce had been violated by Pharnakes, and open war was again being waged. Eumenes and Ariarathes were inside Pontic territory, and the legates' request that the kings put an end to the war involved the withdrawal of their successful troops.[5] In other words, while such a request was a perfectly reasonable one for a mediator to make, Eumenes and Ariarathes were being asked to give up their real advantage for the sake of a peace that the Roman mediators could not promise to supply. Still, Eumenes agreed to the Roman request, and he and Ariarathes withdrew to Galatia. But this final Roman attempt to mediate a settlement was also a failure, chiefly because of the recalcitrance of Pharnakes. When the Roman legates perceived that Pharnakes had no intention of coming to terms, they finally abandoned their mission as a failure, and in the end Eumenes had to win the war by his own resources (179).

The Roman intervention in the war between Eumenes and Pharnakes was typical of their actions during these years. Direct interest in the affairs of Asia was still minimal. Vigorous involvement in Eastern matters would have implied military commitments at some level, either straightforward support of Eumenes or else enforcement of a Roman-dictated settlement between the Asian kings. Furthermore, Eumenes was proving to be an importunate friend as time went on. His continuous appeals to the senate had begun to fall on some deaf ears. Rome was willing to keep its hand in by sending out investigatory legations, and even by making pronouncements on the state of Eastern affairs and trying to mediate between the kingdoms. But at this stage that was as far as Rome was willing to go.

115. Boiotian envoys mediate between Messene and the Achaian League (182)

Polybios 23.16.4–5.

Roebuck, Diss., pp. 101f.; Errington, *Philopoemen*, pp. 193f.

Οἱ δὲ πολλοὶ παρακληθέντες ὑπό τε τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ μάλιστα τῶν ἐκ Βοιωτίας πρεσβευτῶν, (5) οἳ πρότερον ἤδη παραγεγονότες ἐπὶ τὰς διαλύσεις, Ἐπαίνετος καὶ Ἀπολλόδωρος, εὐκαίρως τότε παρέτυχον ἐν τῇ Μεσσήνῃ, ταχέως ἐπακολουθήσαντες ἐπὶ τὰς διαλύσεις οἱ Μεσσήνιοι κατέστησαν πρεσ-

5. On the problem in the manuscripts, and Eumenes' location, see Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 3, pp. 268–69; Hansen[2], p. 103.

Attalos, in the absence of a Pontic counterembassy, made accusations against Pharnakes and asked for the Romans to punish him. Attalos was clearly asking for military support, which the Romans just as clearly did not wish to send. Rather they sent yet another commission, this time to put an end to the war.

When the legates arrived, the truce had been violated by Pharnakes, and open war was again being waged. Eumenes and Ariarathes were inside Pontic territory, and the legates' request that the kings put an end to the war involved the withdrawal of their successful troops.[5] In other words, while such a request was a perfectly reasonable one for a mediator to make, Eumenes and Ariarathes were being asked to give up their real advantage for the sake of a peace that the Roman mediators could not promise to supply. Still, Eumenes agreed to the Roman request, and he and Ariarathes withdrew to Galatia. But this final Roman attempt to mediate a settlement was also a failure, chiefly because of the recalcitrance of Pharnakes. When the Roman legates perceived that Pharnakes had no intention of coming to terms, they finally abandoned their mission as a failure, and in the end Eumenes had to win the war by his own resources (179).

The Roman intervention in the war between Eumenes and Pharnakes was typical of their actions during these years. Direct interest in the affairs of Asia was still minimal. Vigorous involvement in Eastern matters would have implied military commitments at some level, either straightforward support of Eumenes or else enforcement of a Roman-dictated settlement between the Asian kings. Furthermore, Eumenes was proving to be an importunate friend as time went on. His continuous appeals to the senate had begun to fall on some deaf ears. Rome was willing to keep its hand in by sending out investigatory legations, and even by making pronouncements on the state of Eastern affairs and trying to mediate between the kingdoms. But at this stage that was as far as Rome was willing to go.

115. Boiotian envoys mediate between Messene and the Achaian League (182)

Polybios 23.16.4–5.

Roebuck, Diss., pp. 101f.; Errington, *Philopoemen*, pp. 193f.

Οἱ δὲ πολλοὶ παρακληθέντες ὑπό τε τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ μάλιστα τῶν ἐκ Βοιωτίας πρεσβευτῶν, (5) οἳ πρότερον ἤδη παραγεγονότες ἐπὶ τὰς διαλύσεις, Ἐπαίνετος καὶ Ἀπολλόδωρος, εὐκαίρως τότε παρέτυχον ἐν τῇ Μεσσήνῃ, ταχέως ἐπακολουθήσαντες ἐπὶ τὰς διαλύσεις οἱ Μεσσήνιοι κατέστησαν πρεσ-

5. On the problem in the manuscripts, and Eumenes' location, see Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 3, pp. 268–69; Hansen[2], p. 103.

βευτὰς καὶ τούτους ἐξέπεμψαν, δεόμενοι τυχεῖν συγγνώμης ἐπὶ τοῖς ἡμαρτημένοις.

Perhaps the most significant event of the Messenian revolt from the control of the Achaian League in 183/2 was the death of Philopoimen (Livy 39.50; Plut. *Phil.* 19–20). His murder at the hands of the radical Deinokrates and his faction helped to alienate the leaders of the revolt from the people of Messene, who had evidently never been terribly eager for rebellion. Now that the Achaian strategos had been murdered in Messene, the Messenian people began to see their chances for an equitable settlement with Achaia slipping away. By July of 182, when Lykortas invaded Messenian territory and destroyed the harvest, the people were even readier to make peace.[1]

Flamininus had intervened between the Messenians and the League several years earlier (**86**). But by 182 the Romans were conspicuously absenting themselves from Peloponnesian affairs.[2] Nevertheless, the Messenians were guided in the direction of peace by two envoys from the Boiotian League, Epainetos and Apollodoros. These individuals had apparently arrived at some unspecified time before midsummer, intent on mediating a peace settlement between Messene and Achaia. As a traditional friend of both parties, Boiotia was suitable to play the role of mediator.[3] Epainetos and Apollodoros persuaded the people to treat for peace, and Deinokrates and his party no longer dared to interfere.

116. The Achaian League settles the territorial holdings of Megalopolis and Messene-Thouria (shortly after 182)

Six fragments of a marble slab, inscribed on both sides, discovered at Olympia. Fragments A and B together: h: 0.28 m; w: 0.25 m. Fragments C and D together: h: 0.22 m; w: 0.25 m. Fragments E and F together: h: 0.27 m; w: 0.115 m.

W. Dittenberger, *ArchZeit* 37 (1879) p. 131, no. 260 (B); *Dittenberger/Purgold, *IOlympia* 46.

Swoboda, *Klio* 12 (1912) p. 33; F. Hiller von Gaertringen, *IG* V.2, p. xxvii; Tod 8; M. A. Levi, *RFC* 59 (1931) pp. 94–95; A. Aymard, *Les assemblées de la confédération achaienne* (Paris, 1938) pp. 25–26; Robert, *REG* 1939, 123; Roebuck,

1. See Errington, *Philopoemen*, p. 195.

2. The uncooperative (from the Roman point of view) attitude of the Achaian League regarding the Spartan problem, which the Romans had again tried to settle in 184, led to a policy of allowing the Achaians to stew in their own juices for a time (Polyb. 23.9). The senate had not been interested in interfering between the League and Messene in 183 (**113**).

3. Roebuck, Diss., p. 101.

βευτὰς καὶ τούτους ἐξέπεμψαν, δεόμενοι τυχεῖν συγγνώμης ἐπὶ τοῖς ἡμαρτημένοις.

Perhaps the most significant event of the Messenian revolt from the control of the Achaian League in 183/2 was the death of Philopoimen (Livy 39.50; Plut. *Phil.* 19–20). His murder at the hands of the radical Deinokrates and his faction helped to alienate the leaders of the revolt from the people of Messene, who had evidently never been terribly eager for rebellion. Now that the Achaian strategos had been murdered in Messene, the Messenian people began to see their chances for an equitable settlement with Achaia slipping away. By July of 182, when Lykortas invaded Messenian territory and destroyed the harvest, the people were even readier to make peace.[1]

Flamininus had intervened between the Messenians and the League several years earlier (**86**). But by 182 the Romans were conspicuously absenting themselves from Peloponnesian affairs.[2] Nevertheless, the Messenians were guided in the direction of peace by two envoys from the Boiotian League, Epainetos and Apollodoros. These individuals had apparently arrived at some unspecified time before midsummer, intent on mediating a peace settlement between Messene and Achaia. As a traditional friend of both parties, Boiotia was suitable to play the role of mediator.[3] Epainetos and Apollodoros persuaded the people to treat for peace, and Deinokrates and his party no longer dared to interfere.

116. The Achaian League settles the territorial holdings of Megalopolis and Messene-Thouria (shortly after 182)

Six fragments of a marble slab, inscribed on both sides, discovered at Olympia. Fragments A and B together: h: 0.28 m; w: 0.25 m. Fragments C and D together: h: 0.22 m; w: 0.25 m. Fragments E and F together: h: 0.27 m; w: 0.115 m.

W. Dittenberger, *ArchZeit* 37 (1879) p. 131, no. 260 (B); *Dittenberger/Purgold, *IOlympia* 46.

Swoboda, *Klio* 12 (1912) p. 33; F. Hiller von Gaertringen, *IG* V.2, p. xxvii; Tod 8; M. A. Levi, *RFC* 59 (1931) pp. 94–95; A. Aymard, *Les assemblées de la confédération achaienne* (Paris, 1938) pp. 25–26; Robert, *REG* 1939, 123; Roebuck,

1. See Errington, *Philopoemen*, p. 195.

2. The uncooperative (from the Roman point of view) attitude of the Achaian League regarding the Spartan problem, which the Romans had again tried to settle in 184, led to a policy of allowing the Achaians to stew in their own juices for a time (Polyb. 23.9). The senate had not been interested in interfering between the League and Messene in 183 (**113**).

3. Roebuck, Diss., p. 101.

Diss., pp. 102–4; J. Bingen, *BCH* 77 (1953) p. 627; *SEG* XI.1189, XVII.195; Préaux, pp. 254, 297; Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 3, pp. 249–50; Taeuber, p. 35; Bastini, p. 113; *SEG* XXXVII.355; Daverio Rocchi, pp. 100–101, no. 3.

I: Side 1 of A, B, E, and F

- - - - - - - - ἀπε[γρ]α[ψάμεθα]
[τ]ῶ̃ν - - - - - - - - - ἐν οἷς γ]εγράφαμεν
γρά[μμασι κατὰ τὸ ἐπ' Ἀριστομέ]νεος γραπτὸ[ν . . . . .]
τοῖς μ[ὲν παραγενομένοις ἀπὸ τᾶς πόλιο]ς τῶμ Μεγαλο[πολιτᾶν]
Διοφάν[ει Διαίου, - - - - - - - - Λί]χα, Δαμέαι Θε . . . . . .,
Θεαρίδα[ι Λυκόρτα, - - - -μ]ένεος, Πολυβίω[ι Λυκόρτα,]
Ποσειδίπ[πωι - - - - -, - - - - -ω]ι Πασίππου καὶ Φιλί[ωι]
Δαμαίνου, [τοῖς δὲ παραγενομ]ένοις ἀπὸ τᾶ[ς π]όλιος
τῶν [Θ]ουρ[ιέων - - - - - - - -, C]ωκράτει Ἀ[γαθ]ία,
Τρι[- - - - - - - -, περὶ τᾶς χ]ώρας τᾶς ἀ[μφ]ιλλεγομέ-
νας - - - - - - - - - - - - -ιρω ἂν εὐδόκησαν οἱ
Θο[υρ]ιέες [- - - - - - - - - τ]ὰν χώ[ρα]ν κατά τε τὰν
[κρ]ίσιν ἂν [- - - - - - - - - ἔδω]κα[ν οἱ] περὶ
Ἀριστομ[ένη - - - - - - - - - - ἔδ]ωκαν οἱ Μεγαλο-
πολῖτα[ι - - - - - - - - - - - οἱ Μεγ]αλοπολῖται
ἀποστ[είλαντες - - - - - - - - - - τῶ]ν χρόνων
ἐκ τᾶ[ν - - - - - - - - - - - -] καὶ τοὺς ὅρους
οὓ[ς ὥρισαν - - - - - - - - - - -] αἱ πόλεις
ἑκ[άτεραι ἐν τῶι ἐπὶ - - - - - - - - ἐ]νιαυτῶι,
ὡ[ς ἐκ τῶν - - - - - - - - - - - -]την γεγενη-
μ[έν - - - - - - - - - - - - γί]νωσκετε
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -ες[α]ν
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

II: Side 1 of C and D

- - - - - - - - - -ι- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - -c- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - -τα- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
[τ]οῖς Μεγαλοπολίτ[αις - - - - - - - - - τᾶς]
ὁδοῦ, ἄι ἁ [δ]ιάβασις ἁ κατὰ [- - - - - - τᾶι ὁδῶι τᾶι ἀρ]-
χαίαι, ἄι εἰς τὸ [δ]ιατείχι[σμα - - - - - - ἀπὸ δὲ τῶ]
[Φ]ορβαίω εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν τῶ Λ- - - - - - - - - - - - - -
ἐπὶ Κοίλαι δέραι ἐπὶ τα - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Εὐφάμω ὅρους ἀπ' Ἐλ[π]ι[- - - - - - - - - Μεγαλοπολ]-
ιτᾶν - τοῖς δαμιο[ρ]γοῖς [- - - - - - - - - - ἀπὸ δὲ]
τᾶς Φαλάκριος ἐπ' [ε]ὐ[θ]ε[ίας εἰς τὰν περιβολὰν τὰν . . . . . ·]
ἀπὸ δὲ τᾶς περιβο[λ]ᾶς [εἰς τὸν - - λόφον· ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ - - -]
λόφου εἰς τὸ τοῦ Δ[. . . . . ἱερὸν - - - - - - - - - ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ]
πευκώ[δ]εος λόφου [- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - ἐπ' εὐ]-

[θ]είας εἰς τὸ τοῦ Δι[ὸς - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
[ἐ]φ' ἃι ἐστὶ ὁ λάκκο[ς - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
- - - - -ς αὐτοὶ -
- - - - - - - -τι ε- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

III: Side 2 of A, B, E, and F

[- - - - - Μεγαλοπ]ολι[τ- - - - - - - - - -]
- - - - - - - - - ἐπ' εὐθε[ίας - - - - - - -]
[- - - - - Παρ]θενίαι εὐ[θ]έ[ως - - - - - - - - -]
- - - - - - - -λεστις καὶ Θο[υρ - - - - - - - - - -]
. . . . . ιακατοιω [πο]ταμο[ῦ - - - - - - - - - - -]ν
. . . . . ἦσαν ἀπ[ό] τε Μεσσ[ανίων - - - - - - καὶ ἀ]πὸ
. . . ανος τοῦ [. . .] σκίου ε[- - - - - - - - ὁ ὁρισμ]ὸς
[τ]ᾶς χώρας τᾶς ὑπὲρ τὸ ἐν - - - - - - - - - - -ν
εἶμεν [δὲ . . . . .] ἐκκλησί[αν - - - - - - - - - -]α
πόλιμ Με[σσ]ανί[ω]ν προ[σ]κ- - - - - - - - - -ων
ὑπερβάντ[ε]σ το . . . . . αιει . νε- - - - - - -εχω
τα - - - - - - - - - - θεῶ
μὲν κατὰ τὸν νόμον - - - - - - - -ικα .
Με[σσανίω]ν [πόλ]ις? - - - - - - - - - - καὶ . . .
οἱ Μεσσάνιοι τα- - - - - - - - - - - -σαν καὶ
τὸ γραπτόν, ὃ ἔθε[σαν οἱ Ἀχαιοὶ - - - - - - ἐ]ν τᾶι ἐν [Σι]-
κυῶνι συνόδωι [- - - - - - - - - - - χώρα]μ πλὰ[ν]
τὰν Δωρίδα [- - - - - - ἀπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ τοῦ] Ἀνάπου [τ]ο[ῦ]
ἐξ Αἰγυνέ[ας ῥέοντος - - - - - - - - - - - -] τᾶς χώρας
τᾶς Μεσσ[ανίων - - - - - - - - - - - - - κ]αὶ ποτὶ
τὰν ὁδὸν τ[ὰν - - - - - - - - - - - - - -] ἐστὶν
τᾶς Δωρίδ[ος - - - - - - - - - - - - -]ε . . ον
- - - - - -σ- - - - - - - - - - - - - -ι . .
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -πεν
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

IV: Side 2 of C and D

- - - - - - - - - -ρα- - - - - - - - - -
[- - - - - - - - -σ]υντε- - - - - - - - -
[- - - - - - οἱ περὶ Ἀρι]στομέ[ν]η καὶ ἁ [πόλις . .]
- - - - - - - - - - - -δίων ἐπὶ τᾶς ζαμία[ς]
[- - - - - - - - - - τὸ ἱερὸν τ]οῦ Διὸς τοῦ Λυκαίου
[- - - - - - - - - - ἐναν]τίον [τ]οῦ [ψ]ιλοῦ λόφου
[- - - - - - - - - - - ἱ]ερὸν [ε]ἰς τὸ τῶ Διὸς
[- - - - - - - - - - ποτ'] ἄρκτον, τούτω δὲ εἰς τὰν
[- - - - -, τούτω δὲ εἰς τὸν ποτα]μὸν τὸν Ἐλίσοντα,
[- - - - - - - - - - - - - τ]ῶ ἱερῶ τῶ Ἀπόλλωνος
[- - - - - - - - - - - - - τ]ᾶι ὁδῶι τᾶι ἀρχαίαι
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -νε . . . ου, ἀπὸ [δ]ὲ τοῦ

[- - - - - - - - - - - - ἀπὸ] δὲ τοῦ λεύρου τοῦ
[- - - - - - - - - - - - εἰς τὸ ἰε]ρὸν τᾶς Ἀρτέμιτος
[- - - - - - - - - - - - το]ύτω δὲ ἐπὶ τὸ τῶ
80 [- - - - - - - -, τούτω δὲ εἰς Πο]τείδαιαν, τούτω δὲ
[- - - - - - - - - - - - - - ἐ]ν ἄχρωι τῶι ὄρει
[- - - - - - - - - - - - - - τ]ῶι ἐπὶ ταύ[ται . . .]
- -

This very fragmentary inscription offers little in the way of continuous sense. Nevertheless, the overall picture is of some kind of boundary settlement involving Megalopolis, on the one hand, and Messene and the Messenian town of Thouria, on the other.[1] As was often the case, this document was published at an important sanctuary, in this instance, at Olympia. Most of the fragments deal with the actual delineation of the borders and are fairly typical of other documents of this type. There are a few phrases remaining, however, that might be connected with the actual procedure of the case. The final decision in the land dispute appears to have been made by the standard procedure of recourse to neutral judges. The inscription is too incomplete for us to say whether these judges were nominated by or from an official body of the Achaian League itself, or whether they came from a neutral state that had been requested to arbitrate. The possible reference to some general edict of the League (lines 55–57) does not rule out the notion that the actual arbitration was carried out not by a League body but by another state; the Megarians in the third century had arbitrated between Corinth and Epidauros in keeping with a League ruling (**38**). The usual procedure within the Achaian League does seem to have been to designate a third League state as arbitrator.

The historical circumstances of this boundary arbitration can be ascertained from the literary sources on Messene's relationship with the Achaian League.[2] Messene's control of its territory had been curtailed when it had joined the League in 191; in the aftermath of Messene's revolt in 183 it lost still more of its possessions, including the town of Thouria.[3] It was at this time, 182 or very soon thereafter, that a boundary arbitration involving Megalopolis, on the one hand, and Messene and Thouria, on the other, is most likely to have taken place. The meeting of the Achaian League at Sikyon, mentioned in this inscription, may have been that recorded by Polybios.[4] The inscription is interesting from

1. Cf. **145**, an arbitration between Megalopolis and Thouria.

2. See **115**.

3. Polyb. 23.17.1–2. Cf. **86**.

4. Polyb. 23.17.5: εὐθέως ὁ στρατηγὸς τῶν Ἀχαιῶν μετὰ τὸ συντελέσαι τὰ κατὰ τὴν Μεσσήνην συνῆγε τοὺς πολλοὺς εἰς τὴν τῶν Σικυωνίων πόλιν. So the editors of *IOlympia*; however, cf. Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 3, p. 251, who argues against the identification. See also Aymard, *Confédération achaienne*, p. 25 n. 4; Roebuck, Diss., p. 103 n. 167; Larsen, *GFS*, p. 181.

the prosopographical point of view and supports the notion that a state's more prominent citizens were chosen to represent it before an arbitral tribunal. We have the names of several of the representatives of Megalopolis: among them are Diophanes the son of Diaios, Thearidas, and Polybios the historian, all statesmen well known from the pages of Polybios himself. The presence of these influential persons on the Megalopolitan side, as well as Messene's position as a rebellious and defeated member state, confirms that the outlook for Messene in this arbitration must have been bleak from the start.

117. Rhodian judges attempt arbitration between Amphissa and Delphi (179)

This case consists of two separate documents, both of which in all probability refer to the same incident.

I: An inscription on the base of the chariot of the Rhodians at Delphi, honouring the Rhodian judges. H: 0.508 m; w (max.): 0.53 m; d (max.): 0.525 m.

E. Bourguet, *BCH* 35 (1911) pp. 460f.; Dittenberger/Pomtow, *SIG*^{3} 614; *Daux, *FDelphes* III.3.383; Daverio Rocchi 12.1 (lines 3–11, 16–17, 19–20).

II: An inscription from the Treasury of the Athenians at Delphi, honouring the Athenian advocate Apollodoros.

G. Colin, *BCH* 30 (1906) p. 326; id., *Le culte d' Apollon Pythien à Athènes* (Paris, 1905) p. 165; id., **FDelphes* III.2.89; Dittenberger/Pomtow, *SIG*^{3} 615; G. Nachtergael, *Les Galates en Grèce* (Brussels, 1977) pp. 454–56, no. 34; Daverio Rocchi 12.3 (lines 2–5, 8–9).

Tod 22 (I), 23 (II); H. Pomtow, *Klio* 16 (1919) p. 139; M. Holleaux, *REG* 33 (1920) p. xlix; A. Wilhelm, *AAWW* 59 (1922) p. 25; H. Pomtow, *Klio* 18 (1923) p. 271, XVIII, XIX; Steinwenter, p. 182 n. 2; Daux, *Delphes,* pp. 276–80; Lerat, p. 92; Robert, *REG* 1959, 202; Préaux, p. 251; *SEG* XXVII.115; Daverio Rocchi, pp. 132–42; id., *Mélanges*; Ager, *Historia* 40 (1991) pp. 24–25, 29.

I: The decree for the Rhodian judges

[Ἄρχοντος Μαντία, βο]υλε[υόντων Διοδώρου, Ξένωνος, Ϲωσινίκου,]
[ἔδοξε τᾶι πόλει τῶν] Δελ[φῶ]ν ἐν ἀγ[ορᾶι τελείωι cὺμ ψάφοις ταῖς ἐννόμοις·]
ἐπειδ[ὴ ὁ δᾶ]μος [ὁ Ῥ]οδίων [φί]λος ὢν καὶ εὖ[νους ἁμῖν ἔν τε τοῖς ἔμπροcθεν]
χρόνοι[c πο]λλὰc ἀποδείξεις πεποίηται[ι τᾶς τε ποτὶ τὸν θεὸν εὐcεβείας]
καὶ τᾶς ποτὶ τὰμ πόλιν αἱρέϲιος καὶ [εὐνοίας, καὶ νῦν ἐξαποcτειλάντων]
ἁμῶν ποτ' αὐτὸν πρεcβευτὰc τόν τε πρ[όξενον τῶν Ῥ]οδί[ων Πραξίαν]
Εὐδόκου καὶ Εὐκράτη Καλλίκωνος [τοὺc ὑπὲρ Δελφ]ῶν αἰ[τηcομένους ἵνα]
ἀποcτείλῃ τοὺc διακρινέοντας π[ερὶ τῶν τεμενέω]ν κα[ὶ περὶ τῶν ὅρων]

the prosopographical point of view and supports the notion that a state's more prominent citizens were chosen to represent it before an arbitral tribunal. We have the names of several of the representatives of Megalopolis: among them are Diophanes the son of Diaios, Thearidas, and Polybios the historian, all statesmen well known from the pages of Polybios himself. The presence of these influential persons on the Megalopolitan side, as well as Messene's position as a rebellious and defeated member state, confirms that the outlook for Messene in this arbitration must have been bleak from the start.

117. Rhodian judges attempt arbitration between Amphissa and Delphi (179)

This case consists of two separate documents, both of which in all probability refer to the same incident.

I: An inscription on the base of the chariot of the Rhodians at Delphi, honouring the Rhodian judges. H: 0.508 m; w (max.): 0.53 m; d (max.): 0.525 m.

E. Bourguet, *BCH* 35 (1911) pp. 460f.; Dittenberger/Pomtow, *SIG*^{3} 614; *Daux, *FDelphes* III.3.383; Daverio Rocchi 12.1 (lines 3–11, 16–17, 19–20).

II: An inscription from the Treasury of the Athenians at Delphi, honouring the Athenian advocate Apollodoros.

G. Colin, *BCH* 30 (1906) p. 326; id., *Le culte d' Apollon Pythien à Athènes* (Paris, 1905) p. 165; id., **FDelphes* III.2.89; Dittenberger/Pomtow, *SIG*^{3} 615; G. Nachtergael, *Les Galates en Grèce* (Brussels, 1977) pp. 454–56, no. 34; Daverio Rocchi 12.3 (lines 2–5, 8–9).

Tod 22 (I), 23 (II); H. Pomtow, *Klio* 16 (1919) p. 139; M. Holleaux, *REG* 33 (1920) p. xlix; A. Wilhelm, *AAWW* 59 (1922) p. 25; H. Pomtow, *Klio* 18 (1923) p. 271, XVIII, XIX; Steinwenter, p. 182 n. 2; Daux, *Delphes,* pp. 276–80; Lerat, p. 92; Robert, *REG* 1959, 202; Préaux, p. 251; *SEG* XXVII.115; Daverio Rocchi, pp. 132–42; id., *Mélanges*; Ager, *Historia* 40 (1991) pp. 24–25, 29.

I: The decree for the Rhodian judges

[Ἄρχοντος Μαντία, βο]υλε[υόντων Διοδώρου, Ξένωνος, Ϲωσινίκου,]
[ἔδοξε τᾶι πόλει τῶν] Δελ[φῶ]ν ἐν ἀγ[ορᾶι τελείωι cὺμ ψάφοις ταῖς ἐννόμοις·]
ἐπειδ[ὴ ὁ δᾶ]μος [ὁ Ῥ]οδίων [φί]λος ὢν καὶ εὖ[νους ἁμῖν ἔν τε τοῖς ἔμπροcθεν]
χρόνοι[c πο]λλὰc ἀποδείξεις πεποίηται[ι τᾶς τε ποτὶ τὸν θεὸν εὐcεβείας]
καὶ τᾶς ποτὶ τὰμ πόλιν αἱρέϲιος καὶ [εὐνοίας, καὶ νῦν ἐξαποcτειλάντων]
ἁμῶν ποτ' αὐτὸν πρεcβευτὰc τόν τε πρ[όξενον τῶν Ῥ]οδί[ων Πραξίαν]
Εὐδόκου καὶ Εὐκράτη Καλλίκωνος [τοὺc ὑπὲρ Δελφ]ῶν αἰ[τηcομένους ἵνα]
ἀποcτείλῃ τοὺc διακρινέοντας π[ερὶ τῶν τεμενέω]ν κα[ὶ περὶ τῶν ὅρων]

τᾶς χώρας ἃς ἀμφιλλέγοντι Ἀμ[φ]ιcc[εῖς ποτὶ τὰμ πό]λιν, [τούς τε πρεσβευ]-
τὰς ἀπεδέξατο φιλανθρώπως καὶ τ[ᾶς φιλίας τᾶς] ὑπαρ[χούσας ἀξίως ἀπέ]-
cτειλε τῶν πολιτᾶν ἄνδρας ἐννέα [οἵς κ]αὶ πα[ρα]γενομ[ένοις ἐπιμελὲς ἦν]
ἀποδόμεν τὰν κρίcιν, διὰ δὲ τὸ τοὺς [Ἀμφι]ccεῖς μὴ θέλε[ιν ἐπὶ τόπον παρα]-
γενηθῆμεν οὐκέτι cυνετελέcθη ἁ [κρίc]ις· περὶ ὧν τᾶ[ι τᾶς πόλιος ἀξιώcει]
οἱ δικασταὶ παρακολουθηκότες καλῶς [καὶ ὁ]c[ίως ἐμ]φανί[ζοντι τὸ γεγονός·]
ὅπως οὖν εἰδῇ ὁ δᾶμος τὰν Δ[ελ]φῶν αἴ[ρες]ιν κ[αὶ] ε[ὔ]νοιαν [τὰν ποτ' αὐτὸν.]
τύχαι ἀγαθᾶι· δεδόχθαι τᾶι πόλει ἐπαινέcαι τὸν δᾶμ[ον τὸν Ῥοδίων]
ἐπί τε τᾶι ἐν τὸ ἱερὸν εὐcεβείαι καὶ [τᾶι π]οτὶ τὰμ πόλιν [εὐνοίαι καὶ καλο]-
καγαθίαι· παρακαλεῖν δὲ αὐτὸν κα[ὶ ἐν τὸ] λο[ιπ]ὸν διαφ[υλάccειν τὰν εὔ]-
νοιαν τὰμ ποτὶ Δελφοὺc καθὼc ἁρμόζον ἐcτί· ἐπαινέ[cαι δὲ καὶ τοὺc]
αἱρεθέντας καὶ παραγενομένους δικαστὰc ἐπὶ τὰν κ[ρίcιν τᾶς χώρας]
Εὐφανίcκον Καλλιξείνου κ[αθ'] υἱο[θεcία]ν [δ]ὲ Νικαcιδ[άμου, Πιcτόξενον]
Πυθοδότου καθ' υἱοθεcίαν δὲ [Θήρ]ιδο[c], Γοργονᾶ Κλειcιμ[βρότου, Πειθι-
άδαν]
Κλεομβρότου, Βωλίωνα Ἀξάνδρου, Ἀγήτορα Δαμοc[τράτου καθ' υἱοθεcί]-
αν δὲ Τιμοcτράτου, Εὐέλθωνα Ἀντιδότου, Cτράτων[α Ἀριcτοκράτεος,]
Κλεώνυμον Δαμοκράτεος, ὅτι παραγενηθέντες π[άντα τᾶι πόλει cυν]-
[έ]πραξαν cπουδᾶc καὶ φιλοτιμία[c οὐθὲν ἐ]λλείπον[τες ἐν τὸ ἐπι]-
[τυ]χεῖν ἁμῖν τὰ ἀμφιλλ[εγ]όμενα, τὰν [δ]ὲ ἐνδαμίαν ἐπ[οίηcαν καλὰν]
[κα]ὶ ἀξίαν αὐτῶν καὶ τοῦ δάμου τοῦ ἐξαποcτείλαντ[οc αὐτοὺc· εἶναι]
[δ]ὲ αὐτοῖc καὶ προξενίαν καὶ προμαντείαν καὶ ἀcυλί[αν καὶ προεδρίαν]
[ἐ]μ πᾶcι τοῖc ἀγῶcι οἷc ἁ πόλιc τίθητι καὶ τἄλλα ὅca κα[ὶ τοῖc ἄλλοις]
[π]ροξένοις καὶ εὐεργέταις τᾶc πόλιος· πέμψαι δὲ α[ὐτοῖc καὶ ξένια]
[τ]ὰ μέγιcτα ἐκ τῶν νόμω[ν· ἐ]πιμεληθῆμεν δὲ τοὺc ἄ[ρχοντας τᾶc]
[ἀ]cφαλείας αὐτῶν ὅπως παραπεμφθέωντι ἄχρι οὗ κα [αὐτοῖc δοκῇ,]
[κ]αὶ ἀναγράψαι τὰμ μὲν προξενίαν ἐν τὸ βουλεῖον κα[τὰ τὸν νόμον, τὸ δὲ]
[ψ]άφιcμα ἐν τὰν βάcιν τοῦ χρυcέου ἄρματος τοῦ [ἀνατεθέντος τῶι θεῶι]
[ὑπὸ] τοῦ δάμου τοῦ Ῥοδίων.

5: [νῦν ἀποcτειλάντων]: Bourguet. || 7: Καλλίκωνος [καὶ υἱὸν Καλλίκ]ωνα: Pomtow. [ὑπὲρ τᾶc ἀνδρ]ῶν αἱ[ρέcιος]: Holleaux. || 7–8: [ἵνα δικαcτὰc]| ἀποcτείλῃ: Pomtow. || 11: [οἷ κ]αὶ πα[ραγ]ενόμ[ενοι ἐπεδέξαντο]: Bourguet. πα[ραγ]ενομ[ένοις ἐπέτυχεν ἂν]: Pomtow. || 12: διὰ δὲ τοὺ[c Ἀμφι]ccεῖc μ[ὴ] θέλ[ειν τὸν ὁριcμὸν]: Bourguet. [ἐπὶ τοὺc τόπους]: Holleaux. || 12–13: μὴ θέλε[ιν ἐκεῖce παρα]|γενηθῆμεν: Pomtow. || 13: περὶ ὧν τὰ[c ἐντολὰc]: Bourguet. περὶ ὧν τα[ῖc ἐντολαῖc αὐτοῦ]: Pomtow. || 14: [ἐ]μφανί[ζοντι cπουδάν·]: Pomtow. ἐμφανι[cμὸν ἐποιήcαντο]: tentatively suggested by Daux. || 15: [ποθ' αὐτόν]: Bourguet. || 17–18: πόλιν [ἁμῶν καλο]|καγαθίαι: Bourguet. [αἱρέcει καὶ καλο]|καγαθίαι: Pomtow. || 18: διαφ[υλάξειν]: Bourguet. || 25: π[άντα μὲν τᾶι πόλει]: Bourguet. || 26–27: [ἐν τὸ ὑπ|άρ]χειν: Bourguet. [ὥcτε ἂν ἐπι|τ]υχεῖν: Pomtow. || 28–29: [εἶ|ναι δ]ὲ: Bourguet. [δεδόcθαι| δ]ὲ: Pomtow. || 29–30: [προε|δρίαν] ἐν τοῖc ἀγῶcι: Bourguet. || 32–33: τοὺc ἄ[ρχοντας καὶ τᾶc| ἀ]cφαλείας: Pomtow. || 35: τοῦ [Ἁλίου, τοῦ ἀνατεθέντος]: Pomtow.

II: The decree for Apollodoros

Ἀ γ α θ ᾶ ι τ ύ χ α ι.

ἔδοξε τᾶι πόλει, ἐν ἀγορᾶι τελείωι cὺμ ψάφοις ταῖc ἐννόμοις· ἐπειδὴ Ἀπολλό-
δωρος Ὀλυμπιοδώρου Ἀθηναῖος,
[π]αρακληθεὶc ἀπὸ τῶν ἐξαποcταλέντων ὑπὸ τᾶc πόλιος, ἐπέδωκεν ἑαυτὸν
ἀπροφαcίcτως ἐν τὸ cυναγωνί-
[ξ]αcθαι τᾶι πόλει τὰν κρίcιν τὰν περὶ τῶν τεμενέων καὶ τᾶc ἀμφιλλόγου
χώρας, περὶ πλείcτου τιθέμενος
τάν τε ποτὶ τὸν θεὸν εὐcέβειαν καὶ τὰν εὔνοιαν τὰν ποτὶ τὰν πόλιν, καί,
παραγενόμενος, τά τε ποτὶ τὰν κρίcιν
[c]υνέταξε δεόντως, cπουδᾶc καὶ φιλοτιμίας οὐθὲν ἐν[λ]είπων, καὶ τὰν ἐπιδα-
μίαν ἐποιήcατο εὐcχήμονα,
[κα]ί, ὅcον χρόνον ἀξίωcαν αὐτὸν τοὶ κα(θ)ecταμένοι ὑπὸ τᾶc πόλιος, ἐπὶ
ταῦτα ποτέμειvε, cυμφανῆ ποιῶν
[τὰν α]ὐτοῦ αἵρecιν ἂν ἔχει ποτὶ τὰν πόλιν· τύχαι ἀγαθᾶι· δ[ε]δόχθαι τᾶι πόλει
ἐπαινέcαι Ἀπολλόδωρον Ὀλυμπι-
[οδώρο]υ Ἀθηναῖον εὐνοίας ἕνεκεν καὶ φιλοτιμίας τᾶc ἐν [τὰ]ν πόλιν, παρα-
καλεῖν δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ ἐν τὸ [λ]οιπὸν διαφυ-
[λάξ]ειν τὰν αὐτὰν προαίρecιν, εἰδότα ὅτι ἁ πόλιc τοῖc φίλοις καὶ εὐνόοις
καταξίας ἀποδίδωτι τὰc χάριτας διὰ πα-
[ντός, δ]εδόcθαι δὲ αὐτῶι καὶ τοῖc ἐκγόνοις προξενίαν, προμαντείαν, ἀcυλίαν,
προδικίαν, ἀτέλειαν, προεδρίαν ἐν πᾶcι
[τοῖc] ἀγώνοις οἷc ἁ πόλιc τίθητι, καὶ γᾶc καὶ οἰκίας ἔγ[κ]τηcιν, καὶ τἄλλα
πάντα ὅca καὶ τοῖc ἄλλοις προξένοις καὶ εὐε-
[ργέτα]ιc τᾶc πόλιος, εἶμεν δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ θεωροδόκον τῶν τε Πυθίων καὶ
Cωτηρίων, πέμψαι δὲ αὐτῶι καὶ ξένια, ἐπιμελ-
[εῖcθ]αι δὲ τοὺc ἄρχοντας καὶ περὶ τᾶc ἀνακομιδᾶc [αὐ]τοῦ, ἵνα παραπεμφθῆ
ὡc ἀcφαλέcτατα, [ἀνα]γράψαι δὲ καὶ τὸ[ν]
[γραμμ]ατέα τὰν μὲν προξενίαν ἐν τῶι βουλείωι κὰ[τ τὸν νόμ]ον, τὸ [δὲ
ψάφιcμ]α ἐν τὸν τοῖχον τοῦ οἴκ[ου τοῦ] Ἀθηναίων.

7: κατecταμένοι: Pomtow (on the stone). || 9–10: διαφυ|[λάcc]ειν: Pomtow. || 13–14: ἐπιμελ|[ηθῆν]αι: Pomtow. ἐπιμελ[η|θῆμεν]: Nachtergael.

The first document cited here records a decree of Delphi honouring certain Rhodian citizens. The Rhodians were thanked for their action as judges in an arbitration between Delphi and Amphissa, an arbitration that concerned the holy precincts and the borders of some mutually claimed territory (I, lines 8–9). The Delphians had sent a request to Rhodes asking for judges, and Rhodes had complied, sending nine citizens to examine the case. One of the Rhodian judges, Euphaniskos the son of Kallixeinos, was an "expert" arbitrator: he had acted on the Rhodian commission of five that arbitrated the dispute between Samos and Priene over a decade earlier (**74**). The second document is also an honorary decree, this time for a single Athenian citizen, Apollodoros the son of Olympiodoros. Apollodoros acted, apparently not as a judge, but rather in

the capacity of advocate or general overseer of the Delphian interests in an arbitration. The similarity of phrasing between the two documents indicates that the two honorary decrees sprang from the same event.[1] The choice of Rhodian judges, and an Athenian representative, may well be connected to the mediating roles played by these states in recent years, such as their intervention between Rome and Aitolia, or their participation in the peace treaty between Magnesia and Miletos (**94**, **109**).

The present arbitration was apparently a failure. The Amphissans refused to send representatives to the trial, and the tribunal was forced to leave the case unresolved. If the two documents are connected, this impasse might explain the perhaps unusually lengthy stay at Delphi forced on Apollodoros (II, line 7). It is interesting to note that, at least in this instance, the nonappearance of one of the disputants apparently meant that the case could not go forward. In other instances, default sometimes meant automatic forfeiture.[2] From the tone of the inscription, however, the Amphissans may have been right not to appear for the trial. The Delphians are so profuse in their gratitude for the extreme goodwill of the judges that one wonders just how impartial the Rhodians would have been if the case had gone to trial (I, lines 25–28). This is certainly an anomalous situation, where one thanks the judges for their partiality rather than their impartiality.[3]

The arbitration took place (or rather, failed to take place) in the archonship of Mantias, probably the year 180/79 B.C. Some connection might therefore be drawn between the current dispute involving Delphi and Amphissa and the actions of Acilius Glabrio a decade earlier.[4] Amphissa had of course suffered in the confiscations and rededications of sacred land in 190. It might have sought a new arbitration ten years later, at a time when relations between Delphi and the Aitolian League were apparently at a new low, in order to try to recoup some of its losses.[5] However, the fact that the Amphissans apparently refused to appear at the trial would indicate that the initiative came from the side of Delphi. Perhaps the Amphissans had simply refused to vacate some of the territory from which they were banished by the Romans in 190.[6]

1. See Daux, *Delphes,* pp. 277–79.

2. Cf. **39**, **170**, and Piccirilli 36.

3. Cf. **129**, where so much energy is expended on ensuring the incorruptibility and fairness of the judges.

4. Case **88**. Daux (*Delphes,* p. 276) argues in favour of placing the archonship of Mantias in 179/8.

5. On Aitolia's relations with Delphi at this time, see Daux, *Delphes,* pp. 276–77.

6. See Bourguet, p. 463; *SIG*^{3} 614.

118. A multistate tribunal arbitrates between Azoros and Mondaia (soon after 178)

An inscription found at Korkyra by French soldiers in 1812; the stone is apparently lost.

A. Mustoxydis, *Delle cose Corciresi* I (Corfu, 1848) p. 208, no. 13; C. Wachsmuth, *RhM* 18 (1863) p. 540; Blass, *SGDI* 3205; *Dittenberger, *IG* IX.1.689; Dittenberger, *SIG*^{2} 453; Dittenberger/Hiller von Gaertringen, *SIG*^{3} 638; L. Piccirilli, *ASNP* 1970, pp. 322–23; Daverio Rocchi, pp. 107–8, no. 5.

Kern, *IG* IX.2, p. xxi; Raeder 54; Tod 44; L. Piccirilli, *ASNP* 1970, pp. 313–46; Robert, *REG* 1973, 241.

[Στραταγο]ῦντος Θεσσαλῶν
[μὲν Ἱππο]λόχου τοῦ Ἀλεξίππου
[τὸ δεύτ]ερον Λαρισαίου, μηνὸς
[ὡς Θε]σσαλοὶ ἄγοντι Θεμιστίου
[ἁμέρ]αι τριακάδι, Περραιβῶν δὲ στρα-
[ταγο]ῦντος Δημητρίου τοῦ Δημαινέ-
[του Γ]οννέως, μηνὸς καθὼς Περραιβοὶ
[ἄγον]τι Δίου ἁμέραι τριακάδι, ἐπιτρο-
[πὰν] δόντων Μονδαιέων καὶ Ἀζωρι-
[αστᾶ]ν, μναμονεύοντος Λυσάνο[ρος]
[τοῦ] Φιντύλου Ἀπολλωνιάτα κα[ὶ]
[συν]δικαστᾶν Ξενοφάντου τοῦ
[Δα]μέα Κορκυραίου, Κλεοστράτο[υ]
[τοῦ] Δαμάρχου Δυρραχίνου, ἐκρίναμ[ε]-
[ν ἐλθ]όντες ἐπὶ τὰν χώραν, περιαγησα-
[μένων] ἑκατέρων, ὅρους εἶμεν Μον-
[δαιεῦσ]ι καὶ Ἀζωριασταῖς ἀπὸ τ . .
. . . ιο . . ., εἶτ' αὖ Μονδαιέων μὲ[ν εἶμεν]
[. . . . . ., Ἀζω]ριαστᾶν [δὲ . . . ιι . . .]

1–2: Θεσσαλῶν| [Ἱππο]λόχου: Mustoxydis. || 6–7: Δημητρίου Δημαινέ|[του]: Mustoxydis. || 9–10: Ἀζωρι|[αστᾶ]ν: Mustoxydis, Blass. || 10–11: Λυσάνδ|[ρου]: Hiller von Gaertringen. || 14–15: ἐκρίναμε|[σ]: Blass. || 15–16: περιαγησά|[μενοι]: Mustoxydis. || 16–17: Μον|[δαιέων] καὶ Ἀζωρίας ταῖς ἀπὸ: Mustoxydis. Μον|[δαιᾶ]ν καὶ Ἀζωρίας ΤΑΙΣΑΠΟΤ: Blass.

This document records the findings of a mixed tribunal in a boundary arbitration; Korkyra had been responsible for contributing one of the judges to the tribunal. The inscription is dated according to the magistracies of both the Thessalian and the Perrhaibian leagues.[1] Since one of the disputant cities,

1. The Thessalian strategos, Hippolochos, son of Alexippos of Larisa, is known to have held his first *strategia* in 182; his second will have fallen soon after. See H. Kramolisch, *Die Strategen des thessalischen Bundes* (Bonn, 1978) pp. 52, 54.

Azoros, is known to have been a member of the Perrhaibian League, it follows that its opponent in this case, the city of Mondaia, was part of the Thessalian League. Mondaia and Azoros had both agreed to submit to arbitration in order to settle their dispute. It was the common, if not unvarying, procedure for a league to play a major role in an arbitration involving a member state. In this case, however, where the disputants were members of two different leagues, arbitrators were found from outside both.[2] The west coast of Greece provided the mixed tribunal of three judges: Lysanor of Apollonia, Xenophantos of Korkyra, and Kleostratos of Dyrrhachion. The first of these individuals, Lysanor, appears to have acted in some kind of presidential capacity over the tribunal. The tribunal undertook the journey from western Greece to the Thessalian-Perrhaibian border, where they were escorted over the disputed territory by representatives from both sides. The final specifications of the tribunal would have been published in this text, but at this point the inscription breaks off.

119. Rhodian judges regulate the Achaian honours for Eumenes II (c. 175)

Polybios 28.7.8–13.

A. Aymard, *Les assemblées de la confédération achaienne* (Paris, 1938) p. 185 n. 3; Holleaux, *Études*, vol. 1, pp. 441–43; Hansen[2], p. 108; Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 3, pp. 335–36; Berthold, p. 180; Gruen, p. 109; Bastini, pp. 129, 144–45; Ager, *Historia* 40 (1991) p. 29.

Πολλῆς δ' οὔσης ἀπορίας ὁ Πολύβιος ἀναστὰς ἐποιήσατο μὲν καὶ πλείονας λόγους, μάλιστα δὲ προσέδραμε πρὸς τὴν τῶν πολλῶν γνώμην, ὑποδείξας τὸ γεγονὸς ἐξ ἀρχῆς ψήφισμα τῶν Ἀχαιῶν ὑπὲρ τῶν τιμῶν ἐν ᾧ γεγραμμένον ἦν ὅτι δεῖ τὰς ἀπρεπεῖς ἀρθῆναι τιμὰς καὶ τὰς παρανόμους, οὐ μὰ Δί' ἁπάσας. (9) τοὺς δὲ περὶ Σωσιγένη καὶ Διοπείθη, δικαστὰς Ῥοδίους ὑπάρχοντας κατ' ἐκεῖνον τὸν καιρὸν καὶ διαφερομένους ἔκ τινων ἰδίων πρὸς τὸν Εὐμένη, λαβομένους ἔφη τῆς ἀφορμῆς ταύτης πάσας ἀνατετροφέναι τὰς τιμὰς τοῦ βασιλέως. (10) καὶ τοῦτο πεποιηκέναι παρὰ τὸ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν δόγμα καὶ παρὰ τὴν δοθεῖσαν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν, καὶ τὸ μέγιστον, παρὰ τὸ δίκαιον καὶ τὸ καλῶς ἔχον. (11) οὐ γὰρ ὡς ἠδικημένους τι τοὺς Ἀχαιοὺς βουλεύσασθαι τὰς τιμὰς αἴρειν τὰς Εὐμένους, ἀλλὰ μείζους αὐτοῦ ζητοῦντος τῶν εὐεργεσιῶν, τούτῳ προσκόψαντας ψηφίσασθαι τὸ πλεονάζον παρελεῖν. (12) διόπερ ἔφη δεῖν, καθάπερ οἱ δικασταὶ τὴν ἰδίαν ἔχθραν ἐπίπροσθεν ποιήσαντες τοῦ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν εὐσχήμονος ἀνέτρεψαν πάσας τὰς τιμάς, οὕτω τοὺς Ἀχαιοὺς κυριώτατον ἡγησαμένους τὸ σφίσι καθῆκον καὶ πρέπον διορθώσασθαι τὴν τῶν δικαστῶν

2. Cf. **85**, the arbitration between members of the Achaian and Boiotian leagues.

Azoros, is known to have been a member of the Perrhaibian League, it follows that its opponent in this case, the city of Mondaia, was part of the Thessalian League. Mondaia and Azoros had both agreed to submit to arbitration in order to settle their dispute. It was the common, if not unvarying, procedure for a league to play a major role in an arbitration involving a member state. In this case, however, where the disputants were members of two different leagues, arbitrators were found from outside both.[2] The west coast of Greece provided the mixed tribunal of three judges: Lysanor of Apollonia, Xenophantos of Korkyra, and Kleostratos of Dyrrhachion. The first of these individuals, Lysanor, appears to have acted in some kind of presidential capacity over the tribunal. The tribunal undertook the journey from western Greece to the Thessalian-Perrhaibian border, where they were escorted over the disputed territory by representatives from both sides. The final specifications of the tribunal would have been published in this text, but at this point the inscription breaks off.

119. Rhodian judges regulate the Achaian honours for Eumenes II (c. 175)

Polybios 28.7.8–13.

A. Aymard, *Les assemblées de la confédération achaienne* (Paris, 1938) p. 185 n. 3; Holleaux, *Études*, vol. 1, pp. 441–43; Hansen[2], p. 108; Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 3, pp. 335–36; Berthold, p. 180; Gruen, p. 109; Bastini, pp. 129, 144–45; Ager, *Historia* 40 (1991) p. 29.

Πολλῆς δ' οὔσης ἀπορίας ὁ Πολύβιος ἀναστὰς ἐποιήσατο μὲν καὶ πλείονας λόγους, μάλιστα δὲ προσέδραμε πρὸς τὴν τῶν πολλῶν γνώμην, ὑποδείξας τὸ γεγονὸς ἐξ ἀρχῆς ψήφισμα τῶν Ἀχαιῶν ὑπὲρ τῶν τιμῶν ἐν ᾧ γεγραμμένον ἦν ὅτι δεῖ τὰς ἀπρεπεῖς ἀρθῆναι τιμὰς καὶ τὰς παρανόμους, οὐ μὰ Δί' ἁπάσας. (9) τοὺς δὲ περὶ Σωσιγένη καὶ Διοπείθη, δικαστὰς Ῥοδίους ὑπάρχοντας κατ' ἐκεῖνον τὸν καιρὸν καὶ διαφερομένους ἔκ τινων ἰδίων πρὸς τὸν Εὐμένη, λαβομένους ἔφη τῆς ἀφορμῆς ταύτης πάσας ἀνατετροφέναι τὰς τιμὰς τοῦ βασιλέως. (10) καὶ τοῦτο πεποιηκέναι παρὰ τὸ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν δόγμα καὶ παρὰ τὴν δοθεῖσαν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν, καὶ τὸ μέγιστον, παρὰ τὸ δίκαιον καὶ τὸ καλῶς ἔχον. (11) οὐ γὰρ ὡς ἠδικημένους τι τοὺς Ἀχαιοὺς βουλεύσασθαι τὰς τιμὰς αἴρειν τὰς Εὐμένους, ἀλλὰ μείζους αὐτοῦ ζητοῦντος τῶν εὐεργεσιῶν, τούτῳ προσκόψαντας ψηφίσασθαι τὸ πλεονάζον παρελεῖν. (12) διόπερ ἔφη δεῖν, καθάπερ οἱ δικασταὶ τὴν ἰδίαν ἔχθραν ἐπίπροσθεν ποιήσαντες τοῦ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν εὐσχήμονος ἀνέτρεψαν πάσας τὰς τιμάς, οὕτω τοὺς Ἀχαιοὺς κυριώτατον ἡγησαμένους τὸ σφίσι καθῆκον καὶ πρέπον διορθώσασθαι τὴν τῶν δικαστῶν

2. Cf. **85**, the arbitration between members of the Achaian and Boiotian leagues.

ἁμαρτίαν καὶ καθόλου τὴν πρὸς τὸν Εὐμένη γεγενημένην ἀλογίαν, (13) ἄλλως τε καὶ μέλλοντας μὴ μόνον ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὸν βασιλέα τὴν χάριν ἀπερείδεσθαι ταύτην, ἔτι δὲ μᾶλλον εἰς τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἄτταλον.

In the Achaian year 170/69, shortly after Archon had been chosen as the Achaian strategos, with Polybios the historian as his hipparch, the Achaian assembly received envoys from Attalos, the brother of Eumenes II of Pergamon. Attalos petitioned for the restitution of certain honours to his brother, honours that had been accorded to Eumenes by the Achaian League but were subsequently taken away at some time before 172.[1] This request on the part of Attalos sparked a great deal of controversy in the Achaian synod. It was Polybios's own speech, as he reports it, that carried the day. Polybios steered a moderate course, calling for the restoration of some (probably most) of the honours previously voted to Eumenes. It is from this speech of Polybios that we learn of an international court called in to arbitrate between Eumenes and the Achaians at the time of the first quarrel. The Achaians had apparently decided to reduce the honours given to Eumenes, not, as Polybios says, because they felt themselves wronged by Eumenes in any way, but rather because they were offended at his asking for more than they felt he deserved. It does not appear, however, that the Achaian League took their decision unilaterally. A Rhodian judicial commission, headed by Sosigenes and Diopeithes, was invited to judge the matter.[2] The Achaian League had handed down a general decree, and the judges were meant to work out the details, presumably on the basis of arguments from both sides.[3]

As Polybios presents it, the Rhodians overstepped their authority in taking away all of Eumenes' honours. They are said to have acted out of personal spite towards Eumenes, and their judgement is characterized as a foolish mistake. One should note, of course, that the Achaians seemed willing to let this mistake ride until Attalos complained and a new policy intervened. The judges acted as a convenient scapegoat for Polybios: absent and unable to defend their judgement, they provided the excuse for a change of Achaian policy without a loss of Achaian face. But whatever the political rationale that lay behind blaming the Rhodian judges, this declaration by the Achaian League that a Rhodian tribunal had acted out of personal pique rather than a sense of justice would have been bad press for the Rhodian reputation for impartiality.

1. Cf. Polyb. 27.18. Bastini suggests the honours were revoked c. 175.

2. The presence of the word Ῥοδίους has always caused a certain amount of controversy, since it was felt that they would have been completely out of place here. But there is no reason to doubt their appearance, particularly given their reputation in the field of mediation.

3. Cf. the general ruling of the Achaian League in **116**.

120. Mylasa arbitrates between Magnesia and Priene at the request of Rome (c. 175–160)

A marble block inscribed on all four sides, discovered in the Magnesian agora. H: 0.50 m; w and d: 0.83 m. The inscription contains several different documents, including a decree of Magnesia (I), a letter of a Roman praetor (II), the judgement of the Mylasans (III), and a list of advocates (IV).

*****Kern, *IMagM* 93; Dittenberger, *SIG*^{2} 928; Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene* T 531; Dittenberger/Hiller von Gaertringen, *SIG*^{3} 679; V. Arangio-Ruiz, *Fontes iuris Romani antejustiniani*^{2} III (Florence, 1943) pp. 501–4, no. 162 (II); Sherk 7 (II).

M. Holleaux, *REA* 5 (1903) p. 221; A. Wilhelm, *JÖAI* 6 (1903) p. 11; Colin, pp. 509f.; Raeder 73; Tod 66, pp. 140f.; Passerini, *Athenaeum*; *SEG* IV.508; Holleaux, *Études*, vol. 1, pp. 334–35; Magie, *Buckler Studies*, pp. 181–82; Robert, *REG* 1946–47, 195; Magie, *RRAM*, vol. 1, pp. 113–14; vol. 2, p. 964; Wilhelm, *GIRI*, pp. 67–68; Robert, *REG* 1953, 183; *SEG* XIII.494; Holleaux, *Études*, vol. 5, pp. 436–37, 446–47; Robert, *REG* 1958, 389; Johnson et al., *ARS* 38; Préaux, pp. 251f.; N. Lewis/M. Reinhold, *Roman Civilization* I (New York, 1966) pp. 336–37, no. 133; Gruen, p. 108; Sherk, *TDGR* 34; Daverio Rocchi, pp. 170–77.

I: Decree of Magnesia

. . . 15 . . . ν δῆμος . . . 18 . . . ε . . ος- -
. . . . . ἐσχηκὼς τὴν χώραν, ὅπως οἱ δικασταὶ προκ[ρ]ίν[ω]σι τοῖς Μυλ[ασ - - - -]
[κατ?]αστήσωσιν, γράψαντος δὲ καὶ τοῦ στρατηγοῦ τοῦ Ῥωμαίων [Μαάρκου Αἰμυλίου πρὸς]
[τ]ὴν ἡμετέραν πόλιν, ἵνα κριθῶμεν, καὶ πρὸς τὴν Μυλασέων πόλιν, [ἵνα ἀποστείλωσι δικασ]-
τήριον, καὶ τοῦ δήμου ἐξαποστείλαντος πρὸς Μυλασεῖς ἄνδρας καλ[οὺς καὶ ἀγαθοὺς ἐπὶ]
[τ]ὴν αἴτησιν τοῦ δικαστηρίου, Μυλασεῖς ἀκόλουθα πράσσοντε[ς] τῆι [ὑπαρχούσηι περὶ]
ἑαυτοὺς καλοκἀγαθίαι καὶ βουλόμενοι καταχολουθεῖν τοῖς τε ὑπὸ [Ῥωμαίων καὶ ὑφ' ἡμῶν]
δεδογματισμένοις καὶ τῆι ἀπεσταλμένηι πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἐπι[ς]τολ[ῆι ὑπακούσαντες]
ἐχειροτόνησαν δικαστὰς καλοὺς καὶ ἀγαθούς, οἳ καὶ ἐπελθόντες [ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν ἡ]-
μέρας καὶ πλείονας διήκουσαν παραχρῆμά τε ἐπὶ τῶν τόπων [καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐν]
τῶι ἱερῶι τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ ἐμ Μυοῦντι· τῶν δὲ θεῶν μετὰ τῆς τοῦ σ[τρατηγοῦ δικαι]-
οσύνης ἐπιτεθεικότων τέλος τῆι κρίσει καὶ νενικηκότος πάλιν τοῦ δή[μου ἡμῶν τὸν δῆμον τῶν]

Πριηνέων, καθῆκόν ἐστιν τοῖς τε ἐπιγινομένοις τὰ περὶ τούτων ὑπο[δ]ε[δογ-
ματισμένα φανερὰ]
ὑπάρχειν καὶ τὸ πλῆθος εὐχάριστον φαίνεσθαι πρὸς τοὺς καλοὺς καὶ [ἀ]γα-
θ[οὺς ἄνδρας,]
δεδόχθαι τῆι βουλῆι καὶ τῶι δήμωι· ἐπῃνῆcθαι τούς τε ἐγδίκους καὶ τοὺς . ε-
- -
ἐπὶ τῶι προθύμως προ{c}ctῆναι ὑπὲρ τῶν τῆς πατρίδος δικαίων, [χειρο-
τονηθῆναι δὲ]
ἄνδρα, ὃς μετὰ τοῦ ἀρχιτέκτονος Κρατίνου ἐγδώσει κα[τ]ασκευάσα[ι στήλην
ἐκ λευ]-
κοῦ λίθου, ἣν καὶ ctησάτω πλησίον τῆς προϋπαρχούcη[c] π[αραστάδ]ο[c - - -
- -]
καὶ ἀναγραψάτω τό τε ψήφισμα τόδε καὶ τὸ δόγμα τῆς cυγκλήτου καὶ τὴν
[ἐ]π[ιcτ]ο[λὴν]
[τ]ὴν γραφεῖσαν ὑπὸ Μαάρκου πρὸς Μυλασεῖς καὶ τὸ ψήφισμα καθ' ὃ [ἔκρινεν]
Μ[υ]-
λασέων τὸ δικαστήριον καὶ τὴν Μυλασέων ἀπόκριcιν καὶ τὴν ἀπό[φασιν τῶν
δικασ]-
τῶν καὶ τὰ ὀνόματα πατρόθεν τῶν τε δικαιολο[γ]ηθέντων . ε[. . . . . .
τῶν δι]κα[c]τῷ̣ν
καὶ τῶν ἐγδίκων, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τῶν δικαcτοφυλακηcάντων ἀνδρῶν ἐπειδὴ
πάντες τὴν
[καθ'] αὐτοὺς χρείαν παρέcχοντο μετὰ πάcης cπουδῆς καὶ προθυμίας [- - καὶ
cτή]-
λην κατασκευα[cάτω] χ⟨αλ⟩κῆν, ἣν καὶ ctησάτω ἐπὶ τῆς παραστάδος τῆς
νοτίας με⟨τ'⟩ ἐπιγρ̣α̣φ̣[ῆς]
τῆcδε· "ὁ δῆμος νικήcας τὸ δεύτερον Πριηνεῖς τῆι ὑπὲρ τῆς χώρας κρί[cει ἐπὶ
Μυλα]-
[cέ]ων δικαcτηρίου, ἐγδικηcάντων τῶν ὑπογεγραμμένων [ἐγδίκ]ων καὶ ἐ[. .
14 . .] Π- - - -
δικαι Ἀρτέμιδι Λευκοφρυηνῆι" καταχρηcάcθω [δὲ ὁ] χειροτονηθηcόμεν[oc - -
- -]
λοις εἰc τὴν παραστάδα, ὅθεν ἂν ὁ ἀρχιτέκτ[ω]ν πα[ρα]δη[λώcηι· τὸ δὲ ἀνά-
λωμα τὸ πρὸc]
ταῦτα προχορηγηcάτω Παυcανίας ὁ νεωκόρος τῆς Ἀ[ρ]τέμιδος τῆς Λευκο-
[φρυηνῆς - - - λογι]-
cάcθ̣ω̣ δὲ ἐκ τῶν ἐcομένων προcόδων ἐ[κ] τῆς ἱερᾶς χώρ[ας πάcης τῆς - - - - -]
. ου ἀποκατασταθῆναι αὐτῶι πάντα τὰ π[ροχορηγ]ηcόμ⟨ε⟩να - - - - - -
. . . . 23 . . . . ε̣ο̣ . . . 14 . . . ροc . ετοι- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

2: [κατ]εcχηκὼc: Hiller von Gaertringen, *SIG*^{3}. || 2–3: Μυλ[ασέων νόμοις καὶ
ὅρι]α cτήcωcιν: Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene*, *SIG*^{3}. || 4–5: [ἵνα κατασταθῆι
τὸ δικαc]τήριον: Holleaux. || 7: τοῖς τε ὑπὸ [τῆς cυγκλήτου]: Hiller von
Gaertringen, *IPriene*, *SIG*^{3}. || 8: ἐπι[c]τολ[ῆι ὑπὸ Μαάρκου]: Holleaux; Hiller von
Gaertringen, *SIG*^{3}. || 13: ὑπο[δ]ε[δηλωμένα? φανερὰ]: Hiller von Gaertringen,
IPriene. || 14: [ἀ]γαθ[οὺς τῶν ἀνδρῶν]: Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene*, *SIG*^{3}. ||
16–17: [χειροτονῆcαι δὲ]| ἄνδρα: Wilhelm, *JÖAI*; Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene*.

|| 17–18: [στήλην λευ]|κοῦ λίθου: Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene*, *SIG*^{3}. || 18: προϋπαρχούσ̣η[ς] (*sc.* στήλης) π[ερὶ τούτ]ο[υ τοῦ πράγματος]: Dittenberger, *SIG*^{2}; Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene*, *SIG*^{3}. προϋπάρχουσ̣η[ς] π[ρὸς νότ]ο[ν τοῦ Παρθενῶνος (or something similar)]: Holleaux. || 20–21: καθ' ὃ [ἡιρέθη] Μ[υ]|λασέων τὸ δικαστήριον: Dittenberger, *SIG*^{2}; Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene*, *SIG*^{3}. καθ' ὃ [ἡιτήθη]: Holleaux. || 22: τῶν τε δικαιολο[γ]ηθέντων [π]ε[ρὶ τῆς χώρας δι]κα[ς]τῶν: Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene*, *SIG*^{3}. || 24: προθυμίας [τῆι πόλει]: Dittenberger, *SIG*^{2}; Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene*, *SIG*^{3}. || 24–25: [καὶ φιά]|λην: Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene*, *SIG*^{3}. || 27–28: [τῆι] π[ατρί]|δι καὶ Ἀρτέμιδι κτλ.: Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene*, *SIG*^{3}. || 28: χειροτονηθησόμεν[ος ἀνὴρ]: Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene*, *SIG*^{3}. || 28–29: χρυσοῖς ἧ]|λοις: Hiller von Gaertringen, *SIG*^{3}. || 29–30: [τὸ δὲ ἀνάλωμα τὸ εἰς]| ταῦτα: Dittenberger, *SIG*^{3}; Hiller von Gaertringen, *SIG*^{3}. || 30–31: Λευκο[φρυηνῆς παρ' ἑαυτοῦ]: Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene*, *SIG*^{3}. [κομι]|σάσθω: Holleaux, Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene*, *SIG*^{3}. || 31–32: πάσης τῆς [Ἀρτέμιδος ὥστε ἐξ αὐ|τ]οῦ: Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene*. τῆς [Ἀρτέμιδος τοσοῦτο]: Dittenberger, *SIG*^{2}. πάσης τῆς [θεᾶς, ὥστε ἐντὸς τοῦ ἐνιαυ|τ]οῦ: Holleaux; Hiller von Gaertringen, *SIG*^{3}. τῆς [Ἀρτέμιδος ἕως| τ]οῦ ἀποκατασταθῆναι: Wilhelm.

II: Letter of M. Aemilius and *senatus consultum*

. . . . . δόγμα τὸ κομισθὲν παρ]ὰ τῆς συγκλήτου{υ} Ῥω[μαίων - - - - -]
. . . 20 . . . Μάαρκος Αἰμύλιος Μαάρκου [υἱὸς στρατηγὸς Μυλασέων]
[βουλῆι καὶ δήμωι χαί]ρειν. Πρεσβευταὶ Μάγνητες κα[ὶ Πριηνεῖς - - - -]
[. . 12 . . σύγκλ]ητον δῶ{ι}, τούτοις ἐγὼ σύγκλητον ἔδ[ωκα -]
[. . . 16 . . .]βρίων ἐγ κομετίωι· γραφομένου παρῆς[αν - - - -]
[. . 12 . . Φο?]ντήιος Κοΐγκτου Παπειρία Τίτος Μάλλιος Φᾳ[βία? λέρνα?]
[. . . 15 . . .]περὶ ὧν Μάγνη⟨τε⟩ς πρεσβευταὶ Πυθόδωρος Ἡράκλ[ειτος - - ἄν]-
[δρες καλοὶ κἀγαθ]οὶ παρὰ δήμου καλοῦ καὶ ἀγαθοῦ καὶ φίλου συμ[μάχου τε ἡμετέ]-
[ρου κατὰ πρόσω]πον λόγους ἐποιήσαντο καὶ περὶ ὧν Πριηνεῖς πρε[σβευταὶ]
[. . 8 . .]νης ἄνδρες καλοὶ καὶ ἀγαθοὶ καὶ φίλοι παρὰ δήμου καλοῦ κα[ὶ ἀγαθοῦ καὶ φί]-
[λ]ου σ[υ]μμάχου τε ἡμετέρου κατὰ πρόσωπον λόγους ἐποιήσαντο περὶ ἧς
χώρας ἐξεχώρησαν Μάγνητες καὶ τὴν κατοχὴν ταύτης τῆς χώρας ἐξεχώ-[ρησαν]
δήμωι Πριηνέων κατὰ τὸ τῆς συγκλήτου δόγμα ὅπως κριτήριον δοθῇ· περὶ το[ύτου τοῦ]
πράγματος οὕτως ἔδοξεν· ὅπως Μάαρκος Αἰμύλιος Μαάρκου υἱὸς στρατηγὸς δ[ῆμον ἐ]-
λε⟨ύ⟩θερον κριτὴν δῶι ὃς ἂν ἐν αὐτοῖς ὁμόλογος γενηθῇ· ἐὰν δὲ ἐν αὐτοῖς ὁμόλογος [μὴ γίνη]-
ται, ὅπως Μάαρκος Α⟨ἰ⟩μύλιος Μαάρκου υἱὸς στρατηγὸς δῆμον ἐλεύθερον κριτὴ[ν δῶι]

εἰc τούτουc τοὺc λόγουc οὕτωc καθὼc ἂν αὐτῶι ἐκ τῶν δημοcίων πραγμάτω[ν πίcτε]-
ώc τε τῆc ἰδίαc φαίνηται· ἔδοξεν· δc κρινεῖ Μάγνηcιν καὶ Πριηνεῦcιν περὶ ταύ[τηc τῆc]
χώραc τῆc παρὰ Πριηνέων ἀποκεκριμένηc οὔcηc, ἐξ ἧc χώραc Μάγνητ[ec ἐαυ]-
τοὺc ἔφαcαν ἐκκεχωρηκέναι, ὁπότερον ἂν τούτων δήμων εὑρίcκηται ταύτην
χώραν εἰcχηκέναι, ὅτε εἰc τὴν φιλίαν τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ῥωμαίων παρεγένετο, ταύτη[ν]
τὴν χώραν ὅπωc αὐτῶι προcκρίνῃ ὅριά τε cτήcῃ· ἔδοξεν· ὡcαύτωc περὶ ὧν οἱ αὐτοὶ Πρι-
ηνεῖc πρεcβευταὶ κατὰ πρόcωπον πρὸc Μάγνητας πρεcβευτὰc λόγουc ἐποιήcαν-
το περὶ ἀδικημάτων ἃ αὐτοῖc Μάγνητεc πεποιήκειcαν, περὶ τούτου πράγματοc οὗ-
τωc ἔδοξεν, ὅπωc Μάαρκοc Αἰμύλιοc Μαάρκου υἱὸc cτρατηγὸc τὸν αὐτὸν δῆμον
[κρῖν]αι κελεύc[ῃ] δc ἂν περὶ χώραc κριτὴc δεδομένοc ᾖ, δc κρινεῖ ταῦτα ἀδικήματα· εἰ γεγο-
[νότ]α εἰcὶν ὑπὸ Μαγνήτων, ὅcον ἂν καλὸν καὶ δίκαιον φαίνηται διατιμηcάcθω, καὶ ὅπωc
[εἰc] τὸν αὐτὸν δῆμον κριτὴν Μάαρκοc Αἰμύλιοc Μαάρκου υἱὸc cτρατηγὸc περὶ τούτων τῶν
[πραγ]μάτων γράμματα δῶι πρὸc ἣν ἂν ἡμέραν ἑκάτεροι παραγίνωνται πρὸc ἑκάτερα τὰ κρι-
[ματ]α . . . 10 . . . ἡμέραν κρίνωcι [. . . . ὅ]πωc καὶ - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

1–2: Ῥω[μαίων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποcταλέντων πρεcβευτῶν| ὑπὲρ τῶν πρὸc Πριηνεῖc]: Sherk. || 2–3: [Μυλαcέων| ἄρχουcι, δήμῳ χαί]ρειν: Holleaux. || 3–4: πρεcβευταὶ Μάγνητεc κα[ὶ Πριηνεῖc λόγουc ἐποιήcαν|το ὅπωc αὐτοῖc cύγκλ]ητον: Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene*, *SIG*^{3}; Arangio-Ruiz. [ἐμοὶ προcῆλθον or προcήλθοcαν| ἵνα αὐτοῖc]: Holleaux. [ἐμοὶ προcήλθοcαν| ὅπωc κτλ]: Sherk. || 4–5: ἐγὼ cύγκλητον ἔδ[ωκα. cυγκλήτου δόγμα· πρὸ ἡμέ|ρῶν - -]: Holleaux, Sherk. || 6: Φα[λέρνα]: Arangio-Ruiz. || 7–8: Ἡράκλ[ειτοc ἄν|δρεc]: Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene*. [ἄν|δρεc καλοὶ καὶ ἀγαθοὶ καὶ φίλ]οι: Arangio-Ruiz. || 15–16: [μὴ γένηται]: Arangio-Ruiz. || 24: τούτου ⟨τοῦ⟩ πράγματοc: Arangio-Ruiz. || 28: [πρὸc] τὸν αὐτὸν δῆμον: Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene*. || 30: [καὶ καθ' ἣν ἄ]ν ἡμέραν: Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene*, *SIG*^{3}; Arangio-Ruiz; Sherk.

III: The Mylasan award

[- - - - - - - - - - - - - τ]ε καὶ γραφη- - - - - - - - - -
[- - - - - - - - - - - - χ]ρηματιcμῶν ὅμοροc - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - - - ἡμῖν τοῦτο ἠδυνήθηcα[ν - - - - - -]
- - - - - - - - - - - - -ποιούμενοι μηδὲ οἷc . ε- - - - - - -
[- - - - - - - - - - - ἐ]χθέcθαι διὰ τῶν ἀποφάcεων . .

- - - - - - - - - - - -α τῶν ἐπιδεικνυμένων τόπων ἐν
[- - - - - - - - - - π]ρηcθέντων cτεγνῶν ἐν τῆι καταδρομῆ[ι]
- - - - - - - - -ον καὶ Διονύcιον οὐ μόνον διὰ τῶν προγεγραμ-
[μένων . . . . τε]τευχέναι . . . 12 . . .] ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἐχομένων πολλῶι μᾶλλον
[ἀδύνατον ἦν] κατανοεῖν [τὰ ἐμπ]ρη[cθέν]τα ἐν τῆι Ιριηνίδι, διὰ τίνα αἰτίαν οὔτε ἐφυ-
[λάττετο οὔ]τε διακατείχετο ὑπ' οὐ[δ]ενὸc Πριηνέως, εἴτε καὶ, ὡc ἐλέγοcαν οἱ Πριη-
[νέων ἔγδι]κοι, Λύcανδρόν τινα Πριηνῆ πεπιcτεῦcθαι ταῦτα πρότερον ὑπὸ τῶν
[περὶ τὸν Ζ]ηνόδοτον καὶ γενέcθαι κατάδικον Λύcανδρον ὑπὲρ παρορίας, ὅπερ
[πρὸ τῆc ἐγ]δίκης λόγοc ἦν πολὺc καὶ ἱκνούμενοc τοῖc Μάγνηcιν, τὰ γὰρ ὀφειλόμ[ε]-
[να κατὰ τ]ὴν καταδίκην τῆc καθηκούcηc τετευχέναι ἐξαγωγῆc ἤτοι εἰc[πρα]-
[χθείcηc τ]ῆc καταδίκηc ἢ ἀφέcεωc γενομένηc ἢ κατ' ἄλλόν τινα τρόπον λοι-
[. . 8 . .]cην οὐδαμῶc οἱ τῶν Πριηνέων ἔγδικοι ἀπέδειξαν, ἐπίμονα δὲ εὑρέ-
[θη . . κ]αὶ μέχρι τοῦ νῦν χρόνου ὄντα· ἐν οἷc τε καιροῖc ἐλέγετο ἡ καταδίκη
. . . έναι, ὁ Διονύcιοc, ὃν ἔφαcαν πεπιcτευκέναι τῶι Λυcάνδρωι ἐπεδείκνυτο
ἐκ χρηματιcμῶν οὐχ ὑπάρχων ἐν τοῖc τόποιc τούτοιc, ἄλλοτε μὲν πρεcβεύων εἰc Ῥώ-
μην ὑπὲρ τῆc πατρίδοc, ὁτὲ δὲ φυγαδεύων· ὧν εἴπερ ἠβουλόμεθα μηδὲ μνημονεύειν,
ἱκανὸc ἦν λόγοc ὁ κατὰ τὸν ἐμπρηcμὸν καὶ ἡ τῶν κτηνῶν ἁρπαγὴ γεγενημένη ἐκ τῶν τό-
πων τούτων καὶ ὑπὸ Πριηνέων ἀναμφ[ίλεκ]τοc γεγενημένη cυcτῆcαι, ὅτι Μάγνητεc
καὶ ταῦτα διακατείχοcάν τε καὶ ἐνέμοντο· τό γε μὴν λεγόμενον ὑπὸ Πριηνέων πρ[ό]-
τερον, εἰ ἦν Cκυλλίων πεπιcτευμένοc κτήcειc ἐν τοῖc τόποιc τούτοιc ὑπό τε Αἰτωλοῦ
καὶ Θεοδότου Μάγνητοc καὶ ἡ παραναγιγνωcκομένη ἐ[πι]cτολὴ οὐθαμῶc ἡμῖν cυνίc[τη ἃ ἐπ]οίηcαν οἱ Πρ[ι]ηνεῖc . . . . . ην- - - - - - - - - - - -

7: [ἐμπ]ρηcθέντων: Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene*. || 9: [ἐπιτε]τευχέναι: Hiller von Gaertringen, *SIG*^{3}. || 10–11: ἐφυ|[λάccετο]: Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene*. || 13–14: ὁ περ|ὶ τῆc κατα]δίκηc λόγοc: Dittenberger, *SIG*^{2}; Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene*, *SIG*^{3}. || 16–17: λοι|[πὸν λύcεω]c: Dittenberger, *SIG*^{2}; Hiller von Gaertringen, *SIG*^{3}. λοι|[πὸν αἰτία]c: Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene*. λοι|[πογραφίαc]: Wilhelm, *GIRI*. || 17: ἦν οὐδαμῶc: Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene*, *SIG*^{3}. || 17–18: εὑρέ|[θη ἔτι κ]αὶ μέχρι: Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene*, *SIG*^{3}. || 18–19: ἡ καταδίκη γ[ε|γον]έναι: Hiller von Gaertringen, *SIG*^{3}. || 20: ἀλλ' ὁτὲ μὲν: Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene*, *SIG*^{3}.

IV: List of advocates

- - - - - -δικαι Ἀρτέμιδ[ι]
[Λευκοφρυην]ῆι

Ἠ⟨ι⟩ρέθησαν ἔγδικοι·

Διονύσιος	Διονυσίου
τοῦ Σωσικράτου	
Πυθόδωρος	Δημοκράτου
Παυσανίας	Εὐφήμου
Πρωτίων	Ἀνδροτίμου
Πυρωνίδης	Πρυτάνιδος
Ἐπίκουρος	Ἀλκίνου
Ἀρτεμίδωρος	Αἴσχρωνος
Ἀλέξανδρος	Ἀριστοκράτου
Ἀπολλόδωρος	Λεοντέως
Ἀριστοκράτης	Ἄνδρωνος
Διονύσιος	Ἐπικράτου
Βα[κ]χύλος	Θεοφί[λου]

1: [- -] ὁ δῆμος νικήσας τὸ δεύτερον Πριηνεῖς τῆι ὑπὲρ τῆς χώρας κρίσει ἐπὶ Μυλασέων δικαστηρίου, ἐγδικησάντων τῶν ὑπογεγραμμένων ἐγδίκων καὶ ἐ . . . . .|. . . . . τῆι πατρί]δι καὶ Ἀρτέμιδ[ι| Λευκοφρυην]ῆι: Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene*, *SIG*[3].

Sometime in the first half of the second century the Asia Minor cities of Magnesia and Priene, both allies of Rome, turned to the Roman senate to settle a land dispute that had arisen between them.[1] In the 180s Magnesia and Priene had been allies in the war against Miletos (**109**), and one of the issues between Miletos and Magnesia at that time had been the question of the ownership of the land of Myos. As a result of the arbitration that put an end to the war between Magnesia and Miletos, the greater part of the land of Myos was divided between the two. Perhaps the land in dispute between Magnesia and Priene was also part of the old territory of Myos.[2] Priene may have felt betrayed by its ally Magnesia in the settlement of the war and put forth its own claim to the desirable land. It is impossible to say at what point Priene made its first claims. We learn from this series of inscriptions that the appeal to Rome, and the subsequent judgement of Mylasa, was the second occasion of arbitration over the same issue (I, lines 11–13; II, lines 26–28). Both Priene and Magnesia were agreed on consulting their joint friend and ally Rome in order to settle

1. The dating of this series of inscriptions has posed some difficulties in the past. See Holleaux (*Études*, vol. 5, pp. 446f.), who compared this document (the letter of M. Aemilius) with the letter of another Roman magistrate, P. Cornelius Blasio (see **132**), and believed that both should be dated to c. 175–160. It seems clear that there was more than one contentious issue between Priene and Magnesia: in this same instance the Mylasan judges were also asked to deal with the question of certain injuries that the Prienians alleged were committed by the Magnesians (II, lines 24–27). Despite the fact that Priene and Magnesia had been allies in the war with Miletos, they had a past history of hostility between them. See **25**.

2. See Sherk, p. 47 (against *SIG*[3]).

their differences. The Roman senate followed its customary course in these matters. The senators promulgated a *senatus consultum* that laid down some general rules, and then authorized the praetor M. Aemilius to delegate the task of the actual arbitration to an independent Greek city. The peculiarly Roman criteria for judgement in cases of land arbitration bore little resemblance to the notion of legal proof of legitimate ownership enshrined in the Greek idea of an arbitral tribunal. The basic requirement laid down in the *senatus consultum* was that the disputed land was to go to whichever of the two states had possessed it at the time they entered the Roman alliance.[3] Clearly this had little to do with the Greek approach to territorial adjudication; it was instead an example of the Roman manipulation of the Greek system to their own purposes and ways of thought.

In light of this, it is interesting to note that the rationale for the *Mylasan* decision (at least insofar as it can be gathered from the fragmented state of III) does not appear to have been directly related to the demands of the *senatus consultum*. In fact, the arguments brought forth by the two parties imply that the criteria employed by this tribunal were related to the "worthiness" of the two states to hold the land. Magnesia attempted to show, apparently successfully, that the irresponsible Prienian tenure of the land proved that they were unworthy to be in possession of it; while the Prienians attempted to obfuscate this argument by blaming particular Prienian individuals rather than the state as a whole. Ultimately this rationale could have been harmonized with the Roman requirements by the argument that the Prienians had not "truly" been in possession of the land at the time they entered the Roman *amicitia*, but had forfeited that right by their own actions.

121. Rhodes, Ptolemy VI, and others attempt mediation in the Third Macedonian War (172–168)

I: Livy 42.46.3–4.
II: Polybios 27.4.4–6.
III: Polybios 28.1.7–8.
IV: Diodoros 30.2.
V: Livy 44.14.5–13.
VI: Polybios 28.17.4–9.
VII: Appian *Macedonica* 17.
VIII: Polybios 29.7.6–8.
IX: Livy 44.24.6.

3. Cf. **156**, **158**.

their differences. The Roman senate followed its customary course in these matters. The senators promulgated a *senatus consultum* that laid down some general rules, and then authorized the praetor M. Aemilius to delegate the task of the actual arbitration to an independent Greek city. The peculiarly Roman criteria for judgement in cases of land arbitration bore little resemblance to the notion of legal proof of legitimate ownership enshrined in the Greek idea of an arbitral tribunal. The basic requirement laid down in the *senatus consultum* was that the disputed land was to go to whichever of the two states had possessed it at the time they entered the Roman alliance.[3] Clearly this had little to do with the Greek approach to territorial adjudication; it was instead an example of the Roman manipulation of the Greek system to their own purposes and ways of thought.

In light of this, it is interesting to note that the rationale for the *Mylasan* decision (at least insofar as it can be gathered from the fragmented state of III) does not appear to have been directly related to the demands of the *senatus consultum*. In fact, the arguments brought forth by the two parties imply that the criteria employed by this tribunal were related to the "worthiness" of the two states to hold the land. Magnesia attempted to show, apparently successfully, that the irresponsible Prienian tenure of the land proved that they were unworthy to be in possession of it; while the Prienians attempted to obfuscate this argument by blaming particular Prienian individuals rather than the state as a whole. Ultimately this rationale could have been harmonized with the Roman requirements by the argument that the Prienians had not "truly" been in possession of the land at the time they entered the Roman *amicitia*, but had forfeited that right by their own actions.

121. Rhodes, Ptolemy VI, and others attempt mediation in the Third Macedonian War (172–168)

I: Livy 42.46.3–4.
II: Polybios 27.4.4–6.
III: Polybios 28.1.7–8.
IV: Diodoros 30.2.
V: Livy 44.14.5–13.
VI: Polybios 28.17.4–9.
VII: Appian *Macedonica* 17.
VIII: Polybios 29.7.6–8.
IX: Livy 44.24.6.

3. Cf. **156**, **158**.

X: Livy 44.25.5.
XI: Polybios 29.10.1–4.
XII: Polybios 29.11.5.
XIII: Livy 44.29.7–8.
XIV: Livy 44.35.4.
XV: Polybios 29.19.1–9.
XVI: Livy 45.3.3–8.
XVII: Diodoros 30.24.

Matthaei, *CQ*, p. 261; H. H. Schmitt, *Rom und Rhodos* (Munich, 1957) pp. 139–50; Badian, *FC*, pp. 100–101; McShane, pp. 181–82; Errington, *Dawn*, pp. 211f.; Hansen[2], pp. 116–18; B. Schleussner, *Historia* 22 (1973) pp. 119–23; E. S. Gruen, *CQ* 25 (1975) pp. 71f.; G. Calboli, *M. Porci Catonis Oratio pro Rhodiensibus* (Bologna, 1978) pp. 99f.; Will, vol. 2, pp. 275–78; Berthold, pp. 179–94, 240f.; Gruen, p. 118, 564f.; Sherwin-White, pp. 30f.; G. Marasco, *Prometheus* 11 (1985) pp. 137–50; Scafuro, *Historia* 36 (1987) pp. 28–37; Eckstein, *Historia* 37 (1988) pp. 414–44; Hammond/Walbank, *Macedonia*, vol. 3, pp. 532f.; Ager, *Historia* 40 (1991) pp. 29–37.

I: Livy 42.46.3–4

Apud Rhodios legati adiecerunt confidere pacem futuram; auctoribus enim Marcio atque Atilio missos Romam legatos. (4) si pergerent Romani contra foedus movere bellum, tum omni gratia, omni ope adnitendum fore Rhodiis ut reconcilient pacem; si nihil deprecando proficiant, id agendum, ne omnium rerum ius ac potestas ad unum populum perveniat.

II: Polybios 27.4.4–6

Καὶ μετά τινας ἡμέρας ἐπελθόντες ἐπὶ τὴν βουλὴν παρεκάλουν τοὺς Ῥοδίους κατὰ μὲν τὸ παρὸν ἡσυχίαν ἔχειν, ἀποθεωροῦντας τὸ γινόμενον· (5) ἐὰν δὲ Ῥωμαῖοι παρὰ τὰς συνθήκας ἐγχειρῶσι τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιβάλλειν τῷ Περσεῖ καὶ Μακεδόσιν, πειρᾶσθαι διαλύειν. (6) τοῦτο γὰρ πᾶσι μὲν συμφέρειν, πρέπειν δὲ μάλιστα Ῥοδίοις.

III: Polybios 28.1.7–8

Οἱ δὲ περὶ τὸν Τιμόθεον περί τε τῆς ⟨τῶν⟩ φιλανθρώπων ἀνανεώσεως καὶ τοῦ διαλύειν τὸν πρὸς Περσέα πόλεμον, μάλιστα δὲ παρατηρεῖν τὰς τῶν περὶ τὸν Μελέαγρον ἐντεύξεις. (8) περὶ μὲν οὖν τῆς διαλύσεως οὐκ ἐθάρρησαν εἰπεῖν, Μάρκου συμβουλεύσαντος αὐτοῖς Αἰμιλίου· περὶ δὲ τῶν φιλανθρώπων ἀνανεωσάμενοι καὶ λαβόντες ἀποκρίσεις ἀκολούθους τοῖς ἀξιουμένοις ἐπανῆλθον εἰς τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρειαν.

IV: Diodoros 30.2

Ἐξαπέστειλε δὲ καὶ ὁ προειρημένος τοὺς ἀπολογησομένους καὶ διδάξοντας τὴν σύγκλητον ὅτι παρὰ πάντα τὰ δίκαια κρατεῖ τῆς Κοίλης Συρίας Ἀντιόχος ἑαυτοῦ προγονικῆς ὑπαρχούσης. ἐνετείλατο δὲ τά τε φιλάνθρωπα πρὸς Ῥωμαίους ἀνανεώσασθαι καὶ περὶ τῆς πρὸς Περσέα διαλύσεως πειραθῆναι.

V: Livy 44.14.5–13

Tum ab rege Prusia et paulo post ab Rhodiis de eadem re longe aliter disserentes legati auditi sunt. (6) utraque legatio de pace reconcilianda cum rege Perseo egit. Prusiae preces magis quam postulatio fuere, profitentis et ad id tempus se cum Romanis stetisse et, quoad bellum foret, staturum; (7) ceterum cum ad se a Perseo legati venissent de finiendo cum Romanis bello, eis pollicitum deprecatorem apud senatum futurum; petere, si possent inducere in animum ut finiant iras, se quoque in gratia reconciliatae pacis ponerent. haec regii legati. (8) Rhodii superbe commemoratis meritis suis erga populum Romanum et paene victoriae, utique de Antiocho rege, maiore parte ad se vindicata, adiecerunt: (9) cum pax inter Macedonas Romanosque esset, sibi amicitiam cum rege Perseo coeptam; eam se invitos, nullo eius in se merito, quoniam ita Romanis visum sit in societatem se belli trahere, interrupisse. (10) tertium se annum multa eius incommoda belli sentire mari intercluso; inopem insulam esse nec, nisi maritimis iuvetur commeatibus, colendam. (11) itaque cum id ultra pati non possent, legatos alios ad Persea in Macedoniam misisse qui ei denuntiarent Rhodiis placere pacem eum componere cum Romanis; se Romam eadem nuntiatum missos. (12) per quos stetisset quo minus belli finis fieret, adversus eos quid sibi faciendum esset, Rhodios consideraturos esse. (13) ne nunc quidem haec sine indignatione legi audirive posse certum habeo; inde existimari potest, qui habitus animorum audientibus ea patribus fuerit.

VI: Polybios 28.17.4–9

Τοῦ δ' Ἀγεπόλιδος ἐψυχαγωγημένου κατὰ τὴν ὅλην ἀπάντησιν ἰσχυρῶς, λαβὼν αὐτὸν κατ' ἰδίαν εἰς τὰς χεῖρας ὁ Κόιντος θαυμάζειν ἔφη πῶς οὐ πειρῶνται διαλύειν οἱ Ῥόδιοι τὸν ἐνεστῶτα πόλεμον, μάλιστα τοῦ πράγματος ἐκείνοις καθήκοντος. (5) πότερα δὲ τοῦτ' ἐποίει τὸν Ἀντίοχον ὑποπτεύων μή ποτε κρατήσας τῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας βαρὺς ἔφεδρος αὐτοῖς γένηται, τοῦ πρὸς τὸν Περσέα πολέμου χρόνον λαμβάνοντος· (6) ἤδη γὰρ τότε συνέβαινε συγκεχύσθαι τὸν περὶ Κοίλης Συρίας πόλεμον· (7) ἢ θεωρῶν ὅσον οὔπω κριθησόμενα τὰ κατὰ τὸν Περσέα, τῶν Ῥωμαϊκῶν στρατοπέδων ἐν Μακεδονίᾳ παραβεβληκότων, (8) καὶ καλὰς ἐλπίδας ἔχων ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀποβησομένων ἐβούλετο τοὺς Ῥοδίους προνύξας μείσας ἀποδεῖξαι, καὶ τοῦτο πράξαντας δοῦναι τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις ἀφορμὰς εὐλόγους εἰς τὸ βουλεύεσθαι περὶ αὐτῶν ὡς ἂν αὐτοῖς φαίνηται, τὸ μὲν ἀκριβὲς οὐ ῥᾴδιον εἰπεῖν, (9) δοκῶ δὲ μᾶλλον τὸ τελευταῖον εἰρημένον, ἐξ ὧν ἐμαρτύρησε τὰ μετ' ὀλίγον συμβάντα τοῖς Ῥοδίοις.

VII: Appian *Macedonica* 17

Ὅτι Ῥόδιοι πρέσβεις ἐς Μάρκιον ἔπεμψαν, συνηδόμενοι τῶν γεγονότων Περσεῖ. ὁ δὲ Μάρκιος τοὺς πρέσβεις ἐδίδασκε Ῥοδίους πεῖσαι πέμψαντος ἐς Ῥώμην διαλῦσαι τὸν πόλεμον Ῥωμαίοις τε καὶ Περσεῖ. καὶ Ῥόδιοι πυθόμενοι μετέπιπτον ὡς οὐ φαύλως ἔχοντος τοῦ Περσέως· οὐ γὰρ εἴχαζον ἄνευ Ῥωμαίων ταῦτα Μάρκιον ἐπισκήπτειν. ὁ δ' ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τάδε καὶ ἕτερα πολλὰ δι' ἀτολμίαν ἔπραττεν. Ῥόδιοι μὲν οὖν καὶ ὡς πρέσβεις ἔπεμπον ἐς Ῥώμην, καὶ ἑτέρους πρὸς Μάρκιον.

VIII: Polybios 29.7.6–8

(Ὁ Εὐμένης) ὑπέλαβεν οὐκ ἀδύνατον εἶναι τὸ συγκαταβῆναι Ῥωμαίους εἰς ἐξαγωγὴν τοῦ πολέμου καὶ διάλυσιν· (7) πρὸς δὲ τὸ μεσιτεῦσαι ταῦτα καὶ συναγαγεῖν ἐνόμισεν αὐτὸν ἐπιτηδειότατον εἶναι. (8) ταῦτα δὲ συλλογισάμενος ἐφ' ἑαυτοῦ κατεπείραζε τοῦ Περσέως διὰ Κύδα τοῦ Κρητὸς τῷ πρότερον ἔτει πόσου βούλοιτ' ἂν ὠνήσασθαι τὴν ἐλπίδα ταύτην.

IX: Livy 44.24.6

Haec cogitantem providere iubebat, ut aut ad pacem secum faciendam compelleret Romanos aut perseverantes in bello iniusto communes duceret omnium regum hostes.

X: Livy 44.25.5

Hac utriusque partis voluntate explorata, quod fieri etiam sua sponte taedio validioris, metu infirmioris credebat posse, in eo suam operam venditare conciliandae gratia pacis cupiit.

XI: Polybios 29.10.1–4

Ὅτι προτεθείσης χειροτονίας τοῖς Ῥοδίοις, ἐνίκων οἷς ἤρεσκε πέμπειν τοὺς πρεσβευτὰς ὑπὲρ τῶν διαλύσεων. (2) καὶ τὴν μὲν Ῥοδίων ἀντιπολιτείαν τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον [ὡς ἐν τῷ περὶ δημηγορίας τέθειται] διέκρινε τὸ διαβούλιον, (3) ἐν ᾧ πλεῖον ἐφάνησαν ἰσχύοντες οἱ τὰ τοῦ Περσέως αἱρούμενοι τῶν σῴζειν σπουδαζόντων τὴν πατρίδα καὶ τοὺς νόμους. (4) οἱ δὲ πρυτάνεις παραχρῆμα πρεσβευτὰς κατέστησαν τοὺς διαλύσοντας τὸν πόλεμον, εἰς μὲν τὴν Ῥώμην Ἀγέπολιν, Διοκλῆ, Κλινόμβροτον, πρὸς δὲ τὸν στρατηγὸν καὶ Περσέα Δάμωνα, Νικόστρατον, Ἀγησίλοχον, Τήλεφον.

XII: Polybios 29.11.5

Ἔδοξε γὰρ τοῖς Ῥοδίοις ἀποκριθῆναι φιλανθρώπως ἀμφοτέροις τοῖς βασιλεῦσι καὶ διασαφεῖν ὅτι δέδοκται διαλύειν αὐτοῖς τὸν πόλεμον καὶ παρακαλεῖν κἀκείνους εὐδιαλύτους ὑπάρχειν.

XIII: Livy 44.29.7–8

Non benigne modo responsum regibus est, sed palam pronuntiatum bello finem se auctoritate sua imposituros esse; (8) itaque ipsi quoque reges aequos adhiberent animos ad pacem accipiendam.

XIV: Livy 44.35.4

Sub idem tempus Rhodii legati in castra venerunt cum isdem de pace mandatis, quae Romae ingentem iram patrum excitaverant. multo iniquioribus animis a castrensi consilio auditi sunt.

XV: Polybios 29.19.1–9

Ὅτι κατὰ τὸν καιρόν, ἐν ᾧ Περσεὺς ἡττηθεὶς ἀνεδίδρασκεν, ἔδοξε τῇ συγκλήτῳ τοὺς παρὰ τῶν Ῥοδίων πρεσβευτὰς παραγεγονότας ὑπὲρ τοῦ διαλύειν τὸν πρὸς Περσέα πόλεμον προσκαλέσασθαι, (2) τῆς τύχης ὥσπερ ἐπίτηδες ἀναβιβαζούσης ἐπὶ σκηνὴν τὴν τῶν Ῥοδίων ἄγνοιαν, εἰ χρὴ Ῥοδίων λέγειν, ἀλλὰ μὴ τῶν ἐπιπολασάντων ἀνθρώπων τότε κατὰ τὴν Ῥόδον. (3) οἱ δὲ περὶ τὸν Ἀγέπολιν εἰσπορευθέντες ἐλθεῖν μὲν ἔφασαν διαλύσοντες τὸν πόλεμον· τὸν γὰρ δῆμον τῶν Ῥοδίων, ἑλκομένου τοῦ πολέμου καὶ πλείω χρόνον, θεωροῦντα διότι πᾶσιν μὲν τοῖς Ἕλλησιν ἀλυσιτελὴς καὶ αὐτοῖς δὲ Ῥωμαίοις διὰ τὸ μέγεθος τῶν δαπανημάτων, ἐλθεῖν ἐπὶ ταύτην τὴν γνώμην· (4) νῦν δὲ λελυμένου τοῦ πολέμου κατὰ τὴν τῶν Ῥοδίων βούλησιν συγχαίρειν αὐτοῖς. ταῦτα μὲν οὖν οἱ περὶ τὸν Ἀγέπολιν εἰπόντες βραχέως ἐπανῆλθον. (5) ἡ δὲ σύγκλητος χρωμένη τῷ καιρῷ καὶ βουλομένη παραδειγματίσαι τοὺς Ῥοδίους ἀπόκρισιν ἐξέβαλεν, ἧς ἦν τὰ συνέχοντα ταῦτα, (6) διότι τὴν πρεσβείαν ταύτην οὔτε τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἕνεκεν ὑπολαμβάνουσιν ἐσταλκέναι τοὺς Ῥοδίους οὔθ' ἑαυτῶν, ἀλλὰ Περσέως. (7) εἰ μὲν γὰρ τῶν Ἑλλήνων χάριν ἐπρέσβευον, ἐκεῖνον οἰκειότερον εἶναι τὸν καιρόν, ὅτε Περσεὺς τὴν τῶν Ἑλλήνων χώραν ἐπόρθει καὶ τὰς πόλεις, στρατοπεδεύων μὲν ἐν Θετταλίᾳ σχεδὸν ἐπὶ δύ' ἐνιαυτούς ... (8) τὸ δὲ παρέντας ἐκεῖνον τὸν καιρὸν νῦν παρεῖναι σπουδάζοντας διαλύειν τὸν πόλεμον, ὅτε παρεμβεβληκότων τῶν ἡμετέρων στρατοπέδων εἰς Μακεδονίαν συγκεκλεισμένος ὁ Περσεὺς ὀλίγας παντάπασιν ἐλπίδας εἶχε τῆς σωτηρίας, (9) προφανὲς εἶναι τοῖς ὀρθῶς σκοπουμένοις διότι τὰς πρεσβείας ἐξέπεμψαν οὐ διαλύειν ἐθέλοντες τὸν πόλεμον, ἀλλ' ἐξελέσθαι τὸν Περσέα καὶ σῶσαι, καθ' ὅσον εἰσὶν δυνατοί.

XVI: Livy 45.3.3–8

Tradidere quidam legatos Rhodios nondum dimissos post victoriam nuntiatam velut ad ludibrium stolidae superbiae in senatum vocatos esse; (4) ibi Agepolim, principem eorum, ita locutum: missos esse legatos ab Rhodiis ad pacem inter Romanos et Persea faciendam, (5) quod id bellum grave atque incommodum Graeciae omni, sumptuosum ac damnosum ipsis Romanis esset. (6) fortunam populi Romani bene fecisse, quod finito aliter bello gratulandi sibi de victoria egregia Romanis opportunitatem dedisset. haec ab Rhodio dicta. responsum

ab senatu esse: Rhodios nec utilitatium Graeciae cura neque impensarum populi Romani, sed pro Perseo legationem eam mississe. (7) nam si ea fuisset cura, quae simularetur, tum mittendos legatos fuisse, cum Perseus in Thessaliam exercitu inducto per biennium Graecas urbes alias obsideret, alias denuntiatione armorum terreret; (8) tum nullam pacis ab Rhodiis mentionem factam. postquam superatos saltus transgressosque in Macedoniam Romanos audissent et inclusum teneri Persea, tunc Rhodios legationem misisse, non ad ullam aliam rem quam ad Persea ex imminenti periculo eripiendum. cum hoc responso legatos dimissos.

XVII: Diodoros 30.24

Ὅτι οἱ τῶν Ῥοδίων πρέσβεις ἐπὶ τὰς διαλύσεις ἐλθεῖν ὡμολόγουν· τὸν γὰρ πόλεμον πᾶσιν ὄντα βλαβερὸν ἀπεφήναντο.

Over the winter of 172/1 the Romans, intent on a new Macedonian war, granted Perseus a period of truce so that he could send representatives to Rome to discuss a settlement of their differences. Whatever the Roman intent behind this truce, Perseus looked upon it as an important opportunity to employ some diplomacy on his own behalf.[1] He began to cast about for a potential mediator, and his natural choice was to look to Rhodes. Rhodes was known to be a friend of Rome, in spite of the cooling of relations over the last years; but Rhodes was also friendly towards Macedon. In addition, Rhodes had its impressive reputation as an arbitrator and mediator.[2] Rhodes, however, had already been visited by the Roman legation. However reluctant Rhodes may have been, it had decided to support its link with Rome against that with Perseus. It therefore refused to consider any notion of actually supporting Perseus against Rome and seemed reluctant even to offer its traditional services as a mediator if war should break out. The Rhodian reply was essentially self-interested: Rhodes gave Perseus's envoys a friendly reception but asked them vaguely not to request anything of the Rhodians that might damage their relationship with Rome (Livy 42.46.6; Polyb. 27.4.9).

The war, after it finally started in 171 and was conducted by a series of brutal and ineffective Roman commanders, did inspire several attempts at mediation from various Mediterranean powers, including finally Rhodes. It may be compared with Rome's First Macedonian War, also unpopular among various Greek states, and which also called forth several third party attempts to end it (57). Perseus continued to enjoy military successes through 170, and Roman defeats, harsh treatment of their allies, and plundering all contributed to the increasing popularity of the Macedonian cause. Rhodes was probably also suffering economically from the disruption of trade and shipping caused by both

1. See Errington, *Dawn,* p. 210, for a discussion of Philippus's real reason for agreeing to a truce, to delay the Macedonian military preparations and advance the Roman.

2. Cf. **74, 77, 94, 109, 117, 119.**

this war and the Syrian-Egyptian war that broke out in 170/69. Just prior to the outbreak of that conflict embassies arrived in Rome from Antiochos IV and Ptolemy VI. Ptolemy's ambassadors, Timotheos and Damon, were to demonstrate goodwill towards Rome by offering to mediate a peace settlement between Rome and Perseus. But they were advised to say nothing of this aspect of their mission by M. Aemilius Lepidus. Presumably such an offer would remove Ptolemy from the camp of totally committed Roman allies and give him the appearance of a neutral party. This was unadvisable when Egypt was about to become engaged in a major conflict with Syria, a conflict in which it might have to rely on Roman support.[3]

In the spring of 169 the Rhodians sent out two embassies, one, under Hagesilochos, to Rome, and the other, under Hagepolis, to meet with the consul Q. Marcius Philippus in Greece (Polyb. 28.2, 28.17; Livy 44.14). The Rhodian embassy to Greece in 169 apparently met with a friendly welcome; Polybios, followed by Appian, reports that Philippus secretly advised Hagepolis to try to mediate between Rome and Perseus.[4] While the story should not be dismissed out of hand, it is suspect. There is the clandestine atmosphere of Philippus's advice, for example, and the fact that, given the difficulty in which the Rhodians found themselves as a result of their mediation attempt after Pydna, this would naturally be the kind of story they might spread in order to recoup their reputation. Nevertheless, it is far from impossible that a Roman commander might suggest a Rhodian intervention, so long as it would compromise only Perseus's position, not the Roman one.[5] As for the embassy to Rome, Polybios says that it was an attempt to renew friendship and clear up Roman suspicions about Rhodian loyalty, as well as to gain Roman permission for exporting Sicilian grain. Livy, on the other hand, reports that the Rhodians arrogantly asserted that they would make war on whichever side in the Roman-Macedonian conflict refused to cooperate in making peace.

Polybios's version is clearly the more trustworthy of the two.[6] But if the Rhodians did not come to Rome armed with an arbitration offer in 169, another Hellenistic power did make such an offer. This was Prousias of Bithynia, whose

3. See Gruen, p. 689; id., *CQ* 25, p. 79; Eckstein, p. 427.

4. The text of Polybios appears ambiguous, and there is controversy over whether the war (τὸν ἐνεστῶτα πόλεμον) referred to by Philippus was the one between Rome and Perseus or that between Antiochos and Ptolemy. See Gruen, *CQ* 25, pp. 72–74; and Walbank, *Comm,* vol. 3, pp. 350–51. But Polybios himself clearly believed that Philippus was referring to the Macedonian War (as did Appian).

5. For a recent discussion of this affair see Berthold, App. 3.

6. The Livian passage is generally thought to have sprung from the imagination of an annalist (Gruen, *CQ* 25, pp. 59–60; Walbank, *Comm,* vol. 3, p. 327); cf. Dio 20.2 and Zonar. 9.2. Cf. the Tarentine offer to "arbitrate" (**8**). Polybios does say (29.4.7) that Perseus got the Rhodians to join in the war, but this passage should be rejected; see Walbank, *Comm,* vol. 3, p. 365; Berthold, p. 192.

embassy to Rome at this juncture was an effort to put an end to the serious hostilities in the East, hostilities that involved his own kinsman, Perseus.[7] It is worth noting that in spite of what the sources imply about Rome's aggravation with those who tried to mediate its conflict with Macedon, the Romans evidently responded graciously to Prousias, even if they did not comply with his wishes; he certainly did not suffer at all for this attempt.

Polybios and Livy both report a rather dubious tale of Perseus's overtures to Eumenes in 169, and Eumenes' professed willingness to mediate between Rome and his old enemy. According to this story, Eumenes, whose ruling passion is portrayed as cash rather than principle, agreed to take a large bribe from Perseus (500 or 1,000 talents) in order to stay out of the war in 168, or an even larger one (1,500 talents) in order to mediate a peace settlement for Perseus and Rome. The scheme broke down when Perseus proved unwilling to offer a retainer. The story smacks of invention with the purpose of discrediting Eumenes and may emanate from anti-Pergamene Macedon. It did not come out until after the war, a time when more Romans would have been willing to listen to discreditable stories about Eumenes, now that Perseus was crushed and suspicions were raised by Eumenes' lack of vigorous military activity towards the end of the war. This tale aside, however, it is not impossible that Perseus was now exploring diplomatic avenues to peace. Late in 169 Perseus had finally succeeded in bribing and persuading Genthius the Illyrian to join the war on his side, and the Illyrian forces were just enough to create more military difficulties for the Romans by opening a second front in the Adriatic. Rhodes, watching and not participating, would have recognized that Rome was simply not operating with top-notch military efficiency, and the war might drag on for years more. The "pro-Macedonians" are now said to have come to the forefront of Rhodian politics, but it also seems likely that desire for general peace was not partisan in Rhodes: it simply made economic sense for the trading state.[8] When envoys arrived from Perseus and Illyria at Rhodes in 169/8, they found a Rhodes that had now changed its policy and was prepared to intercede and mediate. In the late spring of 168 the Rhodians sent out two embassies, one to Rome and one to the new consul in Macedon, L. Aemilius Paullus, both of which were to urge the Romans to accept the mediation of Rhodes.

The trust placed in Roman military failures by Rhodes, Perseus, and the Illyrians proved false in 168. The praetor Anicius Gallus destroyed Genthius's fleet and removed Illyria from the conflict in the space of a month. But most

7. On the validity of Prousias's offer see Gruen, *CQ* 25, p. 79; Scafuro, pp. 29f.; Eckstein, pp. 434f.

8. See Berthold, pp. 190–91. Gruen (*CQ* 25, p. 76) makes the point that the embassies sent by the supposedly pro-Macedonian politicians were led by some of the pro-*Roman* Rhodians. Hence he argues that Polybios's view of factionalism in Rhodes is exaggerated.

disastrous for the Rhodian reputation at Rome was the victory of Paullus at Pydna. The embassy that was sent to the consul's camp arrived a week before the battle. The consul was not welcoming but informed the Rhodian ambassadors that he would give them his answer within two weeks. Within one, however, the Macedonian army had been destroyed, and the Rhodian embassy, its mission now pointless with Rome the victor, returned home. More disastrous was the coincidence in timing for the embassy that had been sent to Rome. It arrived in the city before the news of the battle of Pydna did, but it was not summoned to its senatorial hearing until after the news broke in the city. The senate already was aware of the purpose of the embassy, and its leader, Hagepolis, was caught in a difficult situation. He still referred to the Rhodian mission to mediate but managed to slip in an official congratulation on the Roman victory. The heated senatorial response probably exposed feelings that had been repressed in recent years only through fear of provoking pro-Macedonian feelings in Rhodes. The breach of friendship, and the obvious fact that the senate had no need or desire to heal it, frightened the Rhodians badly. They attempted to mollify the Romans, but the senate kept them in a state of apprehension for some time. Although Rome stopped short of declaring war on the island, the Rhodians did not feel comfortable until they finally obtained a formal alliance with Rome.

An important question to come out of this complex of events is, do the sources accurately portray the Roman response to offers of mediation? The general implication throughout their coverage of the Third Macedonian War is that Rome was intolerant of attempts on the part of its friends in the East to mediate its conflicts.[9] This view of Roman attitudes has been accepted by some modern scholars.[10] Yet the history of the decades before the war suggests rather that Rome was quite tolerant of such offers, provided always that they would work to its advantage, or at least not to its disadvantage.[11] This proviso means of course that Rome was not willing to submit itself to true judicial arbitration; it was, nevertheless, open to suggestions of mediation.[12] The anger directed at Rhodes was not paralleled by any anger towards Prousias, or towards Ptolemy, whose intent to mediate had been an open secret. It had other motivations, which the sources also reflect. Rome's reasons were political and ranged from the fact that Roman-Rhodian relations had clearly been deteriorating at least from 178/7, while Rhodian-Macedonian relations had been improving, to the more general circumstance that after 168 Rome had

9. For discussion of the sources on the Third Macedonian War, and propaganda regarding the Rhodians, see Schmitt, *Rom und Rhodos*, pp. 211–17; Gruen, *CQ* 25.

10. See in particular Scafuro.

11. See **75**, **84**, **93**, **94**.

12. Eckstein is careful to draw the distinction between Roman attitudes towards mediation and arbitration.

effectively curtailed not only the Macedonian monarchy but the Seleukid one as well. Rhodes no longer had the same value as a Roman friend that it had once had.[13]

122. Rome, Rhodes, and the Achaian League intervene in the Sixth Syrian War (170–168)

I: Polybios 28.1.6–7 and 9.
II: Polybios 28.17.13–15.
III: Polybios 28.19.1–7.
IV: Polybios 28.20.1.
V: Polybios 28.23.1.
VI: Polybios 29.2.1–3.
VII: Polybios 29.24.10.
VIII: Polybios 29.25.1–4 and 6.
IX: Polybios 29.27.1–7.
X: Livy 44.19.13–14.
XI: Livy 45.12.3–7.
XII: Diodoros 31.2.1–2.
XIII: Appian *Syriaca* 66.

Cf. Justin 34.2–3; Josephus *Antiquitates judaicae* 12.242–44; Plutarch *Moralia* 202f; Zonaras 9.25.

J. W. Swain, *CPh* 39 (1944) pp. 73–94; J. Briscoe, *JRS* 54 (1964) pp. 71–73; Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 3, pp. 319, 321–24, 350–51, 361–63, 396–406; E. Paltiel, *Latomus* 41 (1982) pp. 229–54; Will, vol. 2, pp. 311–25; Gruen, p. 114; Sherwin-White, pp. 46f.; Bastini, pp. 156f.; M. G. Morgan, *Historia* 39 (1990) pp. 37–76; Ager, *Historia* 40 (1991) p. 38.

I: Polybios 28.1.6–7 and 9

Διόπερ οἱ περὶ τὸν Μελέαγρον ἦκον, ἐντολὰς ἔχοντες μαρτύρεσθαι τὴν σύγκλητον διότι Πτολεμαῖος αὐτῷ παρὰ πάντα τὰ δίκαια τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιβάλλει πρότερος, (7) οἱ δὲ περὶ τὸν Τιμόθεον περί τε τῆς ⟨τῶν⟩ φιλανθρώπων ἀνανεώσεως καὶ τοῦ διαλύειν τὸν πρὸς Περσέα πόλεμον, μάλιστα δὲ παρατηρεῖν τὰς τῶν περὶ τὸν Μελέαγρον ἐντεύξεις. . . . . (9) τοῖς δὲ περὶ τὸν Μελέαγρον ἡ σύγκλητος ἀπεκρίθη διότι Κοΐντῳ Μαρκίῳ δώσει τὴν ἐπιτροπὴν γράψαι περὶ τούτων πρὸς Πτολεμαῖον, ὡς αὐτῷ δοκεῖ συμφέρειν ἐκ τῆς ἰδίας πίστεως. καὶ ταῦτα μὲν οὕτως ἐχειρίσθη κατὰ τὸ παρόν.

13. Neither did Eumenes, whose relations with Rome also worsened in these years.

effectively curtailed not only the Macedonian monarchy but the Seleukid one as well. Rhodes no longer had the same value as a Roman friend that it had once had.[13]

122. Rome, Rhodes, and the Achaian League intervene in the Sixth Syrian War (170–168)

I: Polybios 28.1.6–7 and 9.
II: Polybios 28.17.13–15.
III: Polybios 28.19.1–7.
IV: Polybios 28.20.1.
V: Polybios 28.23.1.
VI: Polybios 29.2.1–3.
VII: Polybios 29.24.10.
VIII: Polybios 29.25.1–4 and 6.
IX: Polybios 29.27.1–7.
X: Livy 44.19.13–14.
XI: Livy 45.12.3–7.
XII: Diodoros 31.2.1–2.
XIII: Appian *Syriaca* 66.

Cf. Justin 34.2–3; Josephus *Antiquitates judaicae* 12.242–44; Plutarch *Moralia* 202f; Zonaras 9.25.

J. W. Swain, *CPh* 39 (1944) pp. 73–94; J. Briscoe, *JRS* 54 (1964) pp. 71–73; Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 3, pp. 319, 321–24, 350–51, 361–63, 396–406; E. Paltiel, *Latomus* 41 (1982) pp. 229–54; Will, vol. 2, pp. 311–25; Gruen, p. 114; Sherwin-White, pp. 46f.; Bastini, pp. 156f.; M. G. Morgan, *Historia* 39 (1990) pp. 37–76; Ager, *Historia* 40 (1991) p. 38.

I: Polybios 28.1.6–7 and 9

Διόπερ οἱ περὶ τὸν Μελέαγρον ἦκον, ἐντολὰς ἔχοντες μαρτύρεσθαι τὴν σύγκλητον διότι Πτολεμαῖος αὐτῷ παρὰ πάντα τὰ δίκαια τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιβάλλει πρότερος, (7) οἱ δὲ περὶ τὸν Τιμόθεον περί τε τῆς ⟨τῶν⟩ φιλανθρώπων ἀνανεώσεως καὶ τοῦ διαλύειν τὸν πρὸς Περσέα πόλεμον, μάλιστα δὲ παρατηρεῖν τὰς τῶν περὶ τὸν Μελέαγρον ἐντεύξεις. . . . . (9) τοῖς δὲ περὶ τὸν Μελέαγρον ἡ σύγκλητος ἀπεκρίθη διότι Κοΐντῳ Μαρκίῳ δώσει τὴν ἐπιτροπὴν γράψαι περὶ τούτων πρὸς Πτολεμαῖον, ὡς αὐτῷ δοκεῖ συμφέρειν ἐκ τῆς ἰδίας πίστεως. καὶ ταῦτα μὲν οὕτως ἐχειρίσθη κατὰ τὸ παρόν.

13. Neither did Eumenes, whose relations with Rome also worsened in these years.

II: Polybios 28.17.13–15

Ὅτε δὲ καὶ τὸν Ἀγέπολιν συνέβη παραφθέγξασθαι πρός τινας ⟨τῶν⟩ φίλων, ὅτι παρὰ τοῦ Μαρκίου κατ' ἰδίαν ἐντολὰς εἴληφε μνημονεύειν πρὸς τὴν βουλὴν ὑπὲρ τοῦ διαλύειν τὸν πόλεμον, (14) τότε δὴ τελέως οἱ περὶ τὸν Δείνωνα συνέθεσαν ἐν κακοῖς μεγάλοις εἶναι τοὺς Ῥωμαίους. (15) ἀπέστειλαν δὲ καὶ πρεσβευτὰς εἰς τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρειαν τοὺς διαλύσοντας τὸν ἐνεστῶτα πόλεμον Ἀντιόχῳ καὶ Πτολεμαίῳ.

III: Polybios 28.19.1–7

Ὅτι μετὰ τὸ παραλαβεῖν Ἀντίοχον τὰ κατὰ τὴν Αἴγυπτον ἔδοξε τοῖς περὶ τὸν Κομανὸν καὶ Κινέαν συνεδρεύσασιν μετὰ τοῦ βασιλέως κοινοβούλιον καταγράφειν ἐκ τῶν ἐπιφανεστάτων ἡγεμόνων τὸ βουλευσόμενον περὶ τῶν ἐνεστώτων. (2) πρῶτον οὖν ἔδοξε τῷ συνεδρίῳ τοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς Ἑλλάδος παρεπιδημήσαντας πέμπειν πρεσβευτὰς ὡς τὸν Ἀντίοχον κοινολογησομένους ὑπὲρ διαλύσεως. (3) ἦσαν δὲ τότε παρὰ μὲν τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν πρεσβεῖαι διτταί.... (4) ἦν δὲ καὶ παρὰ ⟨τῶν⟩ Ἀθηναίων πρεσβεία περὶ δωρεᾶς.... (5) ἐκ δὲ Μιλήτου παρῆσαν Εὔδημος καὶ Ἱκέσιος, ἐκ δὲ Κλαζομενῶν Ἀπολλωνίδης καὶ Ἀπολλώνιος. (6) ἐξαπέστειλε δὲ καὶ ⟨Πτολεμαῖος⟩ ὁ βασιλεὺς Τληπόλεμον καὶ Πτολεμαῖον τὸν ῥήτορα πρεσβευτάς. (7) οὗτοι μὲν οὖν ἔπλεον ἀνὰ τὸν ποταμὸν εἰς τὴν ἀπάντησιν.

IV: Polybios 28.20.1

Ὅτι κατὰ τὸν καιρόν, ὅτε Ἀντίοχος τὴν Αἴγυπτον παρέλαβε, συνῆψαν τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἑλλάδος πρεσβευτῶν οἱ πεμφθέντες ἐπὶ τὰς διαλύσεις.

V: Polybios 28.23.1

Ὅτι κατὰ τὰς αὐτὰς ἡμέρας κατέπλευσαν ἐκ Ῥόδου πρέσβεις εἰς τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρειαν ἐπὶ τὰς διαλύσεις οἱ περὶ Πράξωνα καὶ μετ' οὐ πολὺ παρῆσαν εἰς τὴν παρεμβολὴν πρὸς Ἀντίοχον.

VI: Polybios 29.2.1–3

Ὅτι ἡ σύγκλητος πυνθανομένη τὸν Ἀντίοχον τῆς μὲν Αἰγύπτου κύριον γεγονέναι, τῆς δ' Ἀλεξανδρείας παρ' ὀλίγον, (2) νομίζουσα πρὸς αὐτὴν τι διατείνειν τὴν αὔξησιν τοῦ προειρημένου βασιλέως, κατέστησε πρεσβευτὰς τοὺς περὶ Γάιον Ποπίλιον, (3) τόν τε πόλεμον λύσοντας καὶ καθόλου θεασομένους τὴν τῶν πραγμάτων διάθεσιν ποία τις ἐστίν.

VII: Polybios 29.24.10

Τῇ δὲ δευτέρᾳ τῶν ἡμερῶν, ἐν ᾗ κατὰ τοὺς νόμους ἔδει τὰ ψηφίσματα προσφέρειν τοὺς βουλομένους, οἱ μὲν περὶ τὸν Λυκόρταν προσήνεγκαν διότι

δεῖ πέμπειν τὴν βοήθειαν, οἱ δὲ περὶ τὸν Καλλικράτην διότι δεῖ πρεσβευτὰς ἐξαποστέλλειν τοὺς διαλύοντας τοὺς βασιλεῖς πρὸς τὸν Ἀντίοχον.

VIII: Polybios 29.25.1–4 and 6

Ὅτι ἕως μέν τινος οἱ περὶ τὸν Ἀνδρωνίδαν καὶ Καλλικράτην ἐχρῶντο τοῖς ὑπὲρ τῆς διαλύσεως λόγοις, οὐδενὸς δὲ προσέχοντος αὐτοῖς ἐπεισήγαγον μηχανήν. (2) παρῆν γὰρ ἐκ πορείας εἰς τὸ θέατρον γραμματηφόρος φέρων ἐπιστολὴν παρὰ Κοΐντου Μαρκίου, δι' ἧς παρεκάλει τοὺς Ἀχαιοὺς ἀκολουθοῦντας τῇ Ῥωμαίων προαιρέσει πειρᾶσθαι διαλύειν τοὺς βασιλεῖς· (3) συνέβαινε γὰρ καὶ τὴν σύγκλητον ἀπεσταλκέναι πρεσβευτὰς τοὺς περὶ Νεμέσιον διαλύοντας τοὺς βασιλεῖς. (4) ἦν δὲ τοῦτο κατὰ τῆς ὑποθέσεως· οἱ γὰρ περὶ τὸν Τίτον ἀδυνατήσαντες τοῦ διαλύειν ἀνακεχωρήκειαν εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην ἄπρακτοι τελείως.... (6) καὶ τὰ μὲν κατὰ τὴν βοήθειαν οὕτω διέπεσε τοῖς βασιλεῦσι, τοῖς δ' Ἀχαιοῖς ἔδοξε πρεσβευτὰς ἀποστέλλειν τοὺς διαλύοντας.

IX: Polybios 29.27.1–7

Ὅτι τοῦ Ἀντιόχου πρὸς Πτολεμαῖον ἕνεκεν τοῦ Πηλούσιον κατασχεῖν ἀφικομένου, (2) ὁ Ποπίλιος ὁ τῶν Ῥωμαίων στρατηγός, τοῦ βασιλέως πόρρωθεν ἀσπαζομένου διὰ τῆς φωνῆς καὶ τὴν δεξιὰν προτείνοντος, πρόχειρον ἔχων τὸ δελτάριον, ἐν ᾧ τὸ τῆς συγκλήτου δόγμα κατ(ετ)έτακτο, προύτεινεν αὐτῷ καὶ τοῦτ' ἐκέλευσε πρῶτον ἀναγνῶναι τὸν Ἀντίοχον, ὡς μὲν ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ, (3) ⟨μὴ⟩ πρότερον ἀξιώσας τὸ τῆς φιλίας σύνθημα ποιεῖν πρὶν ἢ τὴν προαίρεσιν ἐπιγνῶναι τοῦ δεξιουμένου, πότερα φίλιος ἢ πολέμιός ἐστιν. (4) ἐπεὶ δ' ὁ βασιλεὺς ἀναγνοὺς ἔφη βούλεσθαι μεταδοῦναι τοῖς φίλοις ὑπὲρ τῶν προσπεπτωκότων, ἀκούσας ὁ Ποπίλιος ἐποίησε πρᾶγμα βαρὺ μὲν δοκοῦν εἶναι καὶ τελέως ὑπερήφανον· (5) ἔχων γὰρ πρόχειρον ἀμπελίνην βακτηρίαν περιέγραφε τῷ κλήματι τὸν Ἀντίοχον ἐν τούτῳ τε τῷ γύρῳ τὴν ἀπόφασιν ἐκέλευσε δοῦναι περὶ τῶν γεγραμμένων· (6) ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς ξενισθεὶς τὸ γινόμενον καὶ τὴν ὑπεροχήν, βραχὺν χρόνον ἐναπορήσας ἔφη ποιήσειν πᾶν τὸ παρακαλούμενον ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων. οἱ δὲ περὶ τὸν Ποπίλιον τότε τὴν δεξιὰν αὐτοῦ λαμβάνοντες ἅμα πάντες ἠσπάζοντο φιλοφρόνως. (7) ἦν δὲ τὰ γεγραμμένα λύειν ἐξ αὐτῆς τὸν πρὸς Πτολεμαῖον πόλεμον.

X: Livy 44.19.13–14

Moti patres precibus Alexandrinorum extemplo C. Popilium Laenatem et C. Decimium et C. Hostilium legatos ad finiendum inter reges bellum miserunt. (14) prius Antiochum, dein Ptolemaeum adire iussi et nuntiare, ni absistatur bello, per utrum stetisset, eum non pro amico nec pro socio habituros esse.

XI: Livy 45.12.3–7

Ad Eleusinem transgresso flumen, qui locus quattuor milia ab Alexandrea abest, legati Romani occurrerunt. (4) quos cum advenientis salutasset dextramque Popilio porrigeret, tabellas ei Popilius senatus consultum scriptum habentis tradit atque

omnium primum id legere iubet. (5) quibus perlectis cum se consideraturum adhibitis amicis quid faciendum sibi esset dixisset, Popilius pro cetera asperitate animi virga quam in manu gerebat circumscripsit regem ac "priusquam hoc circulo excedas" inquit "redde responsum, senatui quod referam." (6) obstupefactus tam violento imperio parumper cum haesitasset, "faciam" inquit "quod censet senatus." tum demum Popilius dextram regi tamquam socio atque amico porrexit. (7) die deinde finita cum excessisset Aegypto Antiochus, legati concordia etiam auctoritate sua inter fratres firmata, inter quos vixdum convenerat pax, Cyprum navigant. . . .

XII: Diodoros 31.2.1–2

Ὅτι ἀπαντήσαci τὸν Ἀντίοχον τοῖc Ῥωμαίοις, κἀκείνου μακρόθεν ἅμα τῇ φωνῇ ἀcπαζομένου καὶ τὴν δεξιὰν ἐκτείνοντος, ὁ μὲν Ποπίλιος πρόχειρον ἔχων τὸ βυβλίον ἐν ᾧ τὸ τῆς cυγκλήτου δόγμα κατεκεχώριcτο προέτεινε καὶ αὐτὸν ἐκέλευcεν ἀναγνῶναι τὸν Ἀντίοχον· τοῦτο δὲ ἔδοξε ποιεῖν ὅπως μὴ πρότερον ὡc φίλον δεξιώcηται πρὶν ἢ διὰ τῆς προαιρέcεως γνωcθῇ πότερον πολέμιός ἐcτιν ἢ φίλοc. ἐπεὶ δὲ ἀναγνοὺc ὁ βαcιλεὺc ἔλεξε παρὰ τῶν φίλων γνώμην ἂν λαβεῖν περὶ τούτων, ἀκούcαc ὁ Ποπίλιος ἐποίηcε πρᾶγμα βαρὺ δοκοῦν εἶναι καὶ παντελῶc ὑπερήφανον. ἔχων γὰρ προχειρότατον ἀμπέλινον βακτήριον περιέγραψε τῷ κλήματι τὸν Ἀντίοχον καὶ διεκελεύcατο τὴν ἀπόκριcιν ἐν τούτῳ τῷ γύρῳ ποιεῖcθαι. (2) ὁ δὲ βαcιλεὺc τὰ μὲν ξενιζόμενος ἐπὶ τῷ γεγονότι, τὰ δὲ καταπεπληγμένος τὴν ὑπεροχὴν τῆc Ῥωμαίων ἡγεμονίαc, πρὸc ἀμηχανίαν ἐλθὼν καὶ τὰ cύμπαντα λογιζόμενος ἔφη ποιήcειν πᾶν τὸ παρακελευόμενον ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων. οἱ δὲ περὶ τὸν Ποπίλιον ἅμα πάντεc τὴν δεξιὰν αὐτοῦ λαβόντεc ἡcπάζοντο φιλοφρόνωc. ἦν δὲ τὰ γεγραμμένα λύειν παραχρῆμα τὸν πρὸc Πτολεμαῖον πόλεμον. ὁ δὲ βαcιλεὺc ἀκολούθωc τοῖc γεγραμμένοιc τὰc δυνάμειc ἐξήγαγεν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου, ἐκπεπληγμένοc τὴν Ῥωμαίων ὑπεροχήν, ἅτε καὶ προcφάτωc ἀκηκοὼc τὸ τῶν Μακεδόνων πταῖcμα· τοῦτο γὰρ μήπω γεγενῆcθαι δοκῶν οὔποτ' ἂν ἑκουcίωc προcεῖχε τῷ δόγματι.

XIII: Appian *Syriaca* 66

Ἀντιόχου δὲ δώδεκα οὐ πλήρειν, ἐν οἷc Ἀρταξίαν τὸν Ἀρμένιον εἷλε, καὶ ἐc Αἴγυπτον ἐcτράτευcεν ἐπὶ ἕκτον Πτολεμαῖον, ὀρφανευόμενον μετ' ἀδελφοῦ. καὶ αὐτῷ cτρατοπεδεύοντι περὶ τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρειαν Ποπίλιοc παρὰ Ῥωμαίων πρεcβευτὴc ἦκε, φέρων δέλτον ἐν ᾗ τάδε ἐγέγραπτο, μὴ πολεμεῖν Πτολεμαίοις Ἀντίοχον, ἀναγνόντι δὲ αὐτῷ, καὶ λέγοντι βουλεύcεcθαι, κύκλον τῇ ῥάβδῳ περιέγραψεν ὁ Ποπίλιοc, καὶ εἶπεν· "ἐνταῦθα βουλεύου." ὁ μὲν δὴ καταπλαγεὶc ἀνέζευξε. . . .

The role played by Rome in Eastern affairs in the second century is seldom to be seen more clearly than in the history of the period of the Sixth Syrian War. Appeals were made to Rome to induce it to intervene in the Syrian conflict, either to mediate or to send military aid. Even more indicative of the attitude

to Rome was the fact that envoys were sent to the senate by both sides before the war even began, in order to explain and defend their actions. Both sides sent embassies to Rome in the winter of 170/69 prior to the outbreak of war: Antiochos complained of Ptolemy, while Ptolemy's ambassadors were instructed to cultivate good relations with Rome.[1] It is clear that neither the Seleukid nor the Ptolemaic kingdom could afford to ignore the Roman presence.

Throughout the conflict there were efforts to mediate the differences of the two empires. The Roman consul in Greece, Q. Marcius Philippus, may have suggested to the Rhodians in 169 that they put a stop to the war (though there is some ambiguity in Polybios on this point).[2] Ptolemy himself certainly requested several neutral Greek embassies present in Alexandria to mediate with Antiochos, among them Athenians, Achaians, Milesians, and Klazomenians. Although these embassies failed to convince Antiochos of Ptolemy's rights, nevertheless some kind of agreement was eventually reached between the two kings, and Ptolemy joined Antiochos at Memphis.[3] Thereafter the war took on a new aspect, in which Antiochos in effect had become the "guardian" of his nephew Ptolemy VI. When the Rhodian embassy arrived, an embassy originally intending to mediate between Antiochos and Ptolemy VI, it found itself dealing with a different situation. Nevertheless, the Rhodians tried to put a stop to the conflict; but Antiochos exploited the claim that he was merely trying to restore the rightful king to the throne, a throne now "usurped" by Ptolemy VIII and Kleopatra II. He withdrew from Alexandria in 169, but the events of the following year made it clear that the Rhodian mediation had had no real effect, nor was Antiochos in truth concerned about upholding the rights of the elder Ptolemy. Over the winter of 169/8, the brothers and sister reconciled without Antiochos's help.

Either by 169, when Antiochos was besieging Alexandria, or by 168, when his designs on Egypt were clear, Rome became concerned enough to intervene itself.[4] A legation under C. Popilius Laenas was sent out to try to achieve a settlement between Antiochos and Ptolemy. That Rome's concern over the situation was linked closely to its own interests is clear from the fact that Popilius was obviously under instructions to delay his mission until the Macedonian

1. Polyb. 28.1. On the chronology of the war, see Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 3, pp. 321f. Cf. **121**.

2. The reference in Polybios (28.17.4) to τὸν ἐνεστῶτα πόλεμον, which Philippus urged the Rhodians to mediate, was almost certainly intended by Polybios himself to refer to the war between the Romans and Perseus (see **121**). Nevertheless, Rhodes did go on to try to mediate the Syrian conflict (Polyb. 28.17.15 and 28.23). It seems possible that Marcius did suggest mediation in the Syrian War, whether this specific passage refers to the Macedonian War or not. See Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 3, p. 352.

3. Perhaps by mid-April 169? See Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 3, pp. 357–58.

4. Livy 44.19.6; Polyb. 29.2. See Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 3, pp. 361–63, for a discussion of the chronology and sequence of the initial Roman intervention.

War was decided, and then to act accordingly (Livy 45.10.2–3). Rome in the meantime also made it clear to the Achaian League that sending an embassy to mediate between Antiochos and Ptolemy would be considered as a friendly act towards Rome itself. The Achaians decided to send the embassy, but in the end it was the dictation, not the mediation, of the Roman legate Popilius that put an end to the Sixth Syrian War.[5] In one of the more famous examples of brute diplomacy, Popilius, having word of the Roman victory at Pydna, ordered Antiochos out of Egypt. Thus all the attempts at mediation on the part of the various Greek states, and even an earlier and more diplomatic effort on Rome's part, had failed.[6] In the end it was the threat of Roman military power, now freed from the Macedonian conflict, that convinced Antiochos.[7]

123. Rome attempts to mediate between Eumenes II and the Galatians (167)

I: Livy 45.20.1–2.
II: Livy 45.34.10–14.
III: Polybios 30.3.1–2 and 7–9.

Cf. Diodoros 31.12–14.

McShane, pp. 183f.; Errington, *Dawn*, pp. 242f.; Hansen[2], pp. 120f.; Hopp, pp. 51–53; Will, vol. 2, pp. 291–95; Sherwin-White, pp. 37f.

I: Livy 45.20.1–2

> Itaque introductus in senatum gratulatus victoriam est; sua merita eo bello fratrisque, si qua erant, et Gallorum defectionem, quae nuper ingenti motu facta erat, exposuit; (2) petit ut legatos mitteret ad eos, quorum auctoritate ab armis avocarentur.

II: Livy 45.34.10–14

> Cum haec in Macedonia Epiroque gesta sunt, legati, qui cum Attalo ad finiendum bellum inter Gallos et regem Eumenem missi erant, in Asiam pervenerant. (11) indutiis per hiemem factis et Galli domos abierant et rex in hiberna concesserat Pergamum gravique morbo aeger fuerat. ver primum eos domo excivit

5. On the internal Achaian politics behind the mediation efforts, see Bastini, pp. 156f.
6. The mission of T. Numisius Tarquiniensis, probably in 169: Polyb. 29.25.3; Livy 45.17.3.
7. Morgan argues that Polybios has overemphasized the disastrous consequences of the "Day of Eleusis" for the Seleukid kingdom, and suggests that Antiochos might even have been grateful for an excuse to back off from an unjustifiable and unwinnable war.

War was decided, and then to act accordingly (Livy 45.10.2–3). Rome in the meantime also made it clear to the Achaian League that sending an embassy to mediate between Antiochos and Ptolemy would be considered as a friendly act towards Rome itself. The Achaians decided to send the embassy, but in the end it was the dictation, not the mediation, of the Roman legate Popilius that put an end to the Sixth Syrian War.[5] In one of the more famous examples of brute diplomacy, Popilius, having word of the Roman victory at Pydna, ordered Antiochos out of Egypt. Thus all the attempts at mediation on the part of the various Greek states, and even an earlier and more diplomatic effort on Rome's part, had failed.[6] In the end it was the threat of Roman military power, now freed from the Macedonian conflict, that convinced Antiochos.[7]

123. Rome attempts to mediate between Eumenes II and the Galatians (167)

I: Livy 45.20.1–2.
II: Livy 45.34.10–14.
III: Polybios 30.3.1–2 and 7–9.

Cf. Diodoros 31.12–14.

McShane, pp. 183f.; Errington, *Dawn*, pp. 242f.; Hansen[2], pp. 120f.; Hopp, pp. 51–53; Will, vol. 2, pp. 291–95; Sherwin-White, pp. 37f.

I: Livy 45.20.1–2

> Itaque introductus in senatum gratulatus victoriam est; sua merita eo bello fratrisque, si qua erant, et Gallorum defectionem, quae nuper ingenti motu facta erat, exposuit; (2) petit ut legatos mitteret ad eos, quorum auctoritate ab armis avocarentur.

II: Livy 45.34.10–14

> Cum haec in Macedonia Epiroque gesta sunt, legati, qui cum Attalo ad finiendum bellum inter Gallos et regem Eumenem missi erant, in Asiam pervenerant. (11) indutiis per hiemem factis et Galli domos abierant et rex in hiberna concesserat Pergamum gravique morbo aeger fuerat. ver primum eos domo excivit

5. On the internal Achaian politics behind the mediation efforts, see Bastini, pp. 156f.
6. The mission of T. Numisius Tarquiniensis, probably in 169: Polyb. 29.25.3; Livy 45.17.3.
7. Morgan argues that Polybios has overemphasized the disastrous consequences of the "Day of Eleusis" for the Seleukid kingdom, and suggests that Antiochos might even have been grateful for an excuse to back off from an unjustifiable and unwinnable war.

iamque Synnada pervenerant et Eumenes ad Sardis undique exercitum contraxerat. (12) ibi Romani cum Solovettium, ducem Gallorum, Synnadis esse comperissent eo proficisci decreverunt ad colloquium; Attalus cum eis profectus, sed castra Gallorum intrare eum non placuit, ne animi ex disceptatione irritarentur. (13) P. Licinius consularis cum regulo Gallorum est locutus rettulitque ferociorem eum deprecando factum, (14) ut mirum videri possit inter tam opulentos reges, Antiochum Ptolemaeumque, tantum legatorum Romanorum verba valuisse ut extemplo pacem facerent, apud Gallos nullius momenti fuisse.

III: Polybios 30.3.1–2 and 7–9

Διόπερ εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν σύγκλητον ὁ προειρημένος συνεχάρη μὲν ἐπὶ τοῖς γεγονόσιν καὶ περὶ τῆς καθ' αὐτὸν εὐνοίας καὶ προθυμίας, ἣν παρέσχετο κατὰ τὸν πρὸς Περσέα πόλεμον, ἀπελογίσατο· (2) παραπλησίως δὲ καὶ περὶ τοῦ πέμψαι πρεσβευτὰς τοὺς παρακαθέξοντας τὴν τῶν Γαλατῶν ἀπόνοιαν καὶ πάλιν εἰς τὴν ἐξ ἀρχῆς αὐτοὺς ἀποκαταστήσοντας διάθεσιν παρεκάλεσε διὰ πλειόνων.... (7) τοὺς δὲ περὶ τὸν Πόπλιον Λικίννιον ἔπεμψε πρεσβευτὰς πρὸς τοὺς Γαλάτας. οἷς ποίας μὲν ἔδωκεν ἐντολὰς εἰπεῖν οὐ ῥᾴδιον, (8) στοχάζεσθαι δ' ἐκ τῶν μετὰ ταῦτα συμβάντων οὐ δυσχερές. (9) τοῦτο δ' ἔσται δῆλον ἐκ τῶν πράξεων αὐτῶν.

The visit of Attalos to Rome in the embassy season of 168/7 is most noteworthy for the edifying, if dubious, tale of Attalos's temptation and redemption (Polyb. 30.1–2; Livy 45.19). One of the issues that has been somewhat obscured in the process of the transmission of this tale is the Pergamene request for aid in the ongoing Galatian rebellion. Attalos evidently had learned not to request a Roman military presence; instead this time he specifically asked for mediators. The Greeks and the Hellenistic rulers were growing accustomed to the Roman way of doing things, and to their habit of sending out legates. Here was an opportunity to exploit that custom. The senate agreed to send out a commission under Publius Licinius Crassus to meet with the Galatians. The legates' purpose was apparently not so much to mediate between Eumenes and the Galatians as it was to persuade the Galatians to abandon their uprising. Presumably, however, a peaceful negotiation, carried out by the Romans and aimed at inducing the Galatians to lay aside their arms, would have involved compromise on both sides. The Romans went to Synnada to confer with Solovettius, the Galatian leader, but Crassus, in speaking with Solovettius, found that he became more intractable the more the Romans appealed to him. The Roman mediators therefore abandoned their mission, and Eumenes was forced to return to the fight.

The treatment Eumenes received when he came to Italy himself in the winter of 167/6 led Polybios to believe that the Romans secretly encouraged, and only publicly deprecated, the Galatian revolt. The senate refused to see the king, and he was able to come no farther than Brundisium. Polybios believed that this refusal was motivated by a desire to humiliate Eumenes, and the knowledge that

such a refusal would encourage his enemies, the Galatians (Polyb. 30.19). This belief expressed puts a rather sinister slant on the Roman embassy dispatched as a favour to Eumenes' brother Attalos.[1] But even if one does not fully accept the Polybian version of the underlying anti-Eumenean currents of Roman policy, it is clear that the Romans were no longer as amenable to Eumenes' constant requests for aid and support. In the aftermath of the Third Macedonian War and the Sixth Syrian War, Rome had become distinctly less friendly to its traditional allies, Rhodes and Pergamon. It was not necessary for Rome to concoct outright schemes with the Galatians; a simple indifference to Eumenes' affairs would have been enough to create difficulty for the Pergamene king, who had relied on (admittedly fitful) Roman support for the past two decades.

124. Rhodes arbitrates between Mylasa and Euromos (167?. or first century?)

An inscription discovered in the town of Mendelia (Caria). H: 0.4 m; w: 0.4 m; d: 0.17 m.

E. Hula/E. Szanto, *SAWW* 132.2 (1895) p. 9, no. 1; **SEG* XXXIII.861 (from restorations of Robert).

L. Robert, *BCH* 102 (1978) p. 517; J. Robert and L. Robert, *Fouilles d'Amyzon* I (Paris, 1983) pp. 203–4; Blümel, *IMylasa* II, p. 13.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - -IMI- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - -Ιντα κίνδυνον ὄντα ἀνεν- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
[ἐπε]τέλεσεν τὰν πρεσβείαν καὶ αὐτ[- - - - - ἐποιήσατο]
[καθ]ό[τι κα]θῆκον ἦν λόγους, τὸ κριτήριο[ν - - - - - τὴν πᾶ]-
5 σα[ν σπου]δὴν καὶ φιλοτιμίαν εἰσφερόμενος - - - - - - - - - -
επιτ . . . τ . . . ιν ἐμ πᾶσιν, ἀπετρείψατο (sic) - - - - - - - - - -
ον τὰς Μυλασέων κατὰ τοῦ δήμου η- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
δοθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ στρα[τη]γοῦ κριτήριο[ν - - - - - - - - - - - -]
- -λεσαν ἡμῖν Μυλασεῖς, ἴσο[ν καὶ] δίκαιον [τοῦ δὲ κριτηρίου]
10 ὀφείλοντος τελεῖσθαι ἐν τῆι Ῥοδίων [πόλει]
[κ]αὶ ἐμ πολλοῖς [[. . . .]] εὔνοιαν καὶ καλο[καγαθίαν - - -]
κῶς προσεκαλέσατο καὶ τοῦτον ὁ [δῆμος εἰς τὸν τῆς]
[π]ατρίδος ἀγῶνα ὃς καὶ δι[ὰ] παντὸς - - - - - - - -
[ὑ]πὲ[ρ] τοῦ δήμου καὶ τότε προσκλη[θεὶς οὐκ ἐξέκλινεν τὸν]
15 κίνδυνον ὄντα οὐ μικρὸν τῶι μὴ μό[νον - - - - - - - - - -]
[κίν]δυνον εἶναι, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ τι[μ- - - - - - -]

1. See Hansen[2] (p. 122), who clearly accepts Polybios's interpretation: "This Roman mission was not trying to make peace but was actually intriguing with the Gauls against the Pergamenes."

such a refusal would encourage his enemies, the Galatians (Polyb. 30.19). This belief expressed puts a rather sinister slant on the Roman embassy dispatched as a favour to Eumenes' brother Attalos.[1] But even if one does not fully accept the Polybian version of the underlying anti-Eumenean currents of Roman policy, it is clear that the Romans were no longer as amenable to Eumenes' constant requests for aid and support. In the aftermath of the Third Macedonian War and the Sixth Syrian War, Rome had become distinctly less friendly to its traditional allies, Rhodes and Pergamon. It was not necessary for Rome to concoct outright schemes with the Galatians; a simple indifference to Eumenes' affairs would have been enough to create difficulty for the Pergamene king, who had relied on (admittedly fitful) Roman support for the past two decades.

124. Rhodes arbitrates between Mylasa and Euromos (167?. or first century?)

An inscription discovered in the town of Mendelia (Caria). H: 0.4 m; w: 0.4 m; d: 0.17 m.

E. Hula/E. Szanto, *SAWW* 132.2 (1895) p. 9, no. 1; **SEG* XXXIII.861 (from restorations of Robert).

L. Robert, *BCH* 102 (1978) p. 517; J. Robert and L. Robert, *Fouilles d'Amyzon* I (Paris, 1983) pp. 203–4; Blümel, *IMylasa* II, p. 13.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - -IMI- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - -Ιντα κίνδυνον ὄντα ἀνεν- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
[ἐπε]τέλεσεν τὰν πρεσβείαν καὶ αὐτ[- - - - - ἐποιήσατο]
[καθ]ό[τι κα]θῆκον ἦν λόγους, τὸ κριτήριο[ν - - - - - τὴν πᾶ]-
5 σα[ν σπου]δὴν καὶ φιλοτιμίαν εἰσφερόμενος - - - - - - - - - -
επιτ . . . τ . . . ιν ἐμ πᾶσιν, ἀπετρείψατο (sic) - - - - - - - - - -
ον τὰς Μυλασέων κατὰ τοῦ δήμου η- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
δοθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ στρα[τη]γοῦ κριτήριο[ν - - - - - - - - - - - -]
- -λεσαν ἡμῖν Μυλασεῖς, ἴσο[ν καὶ] δίκαιον [τοῦ δὲ κριτηρίου]
10 ὀφείλοντος τελεῖσθαι ἐν τῆι Ῥοδίων [πόλει]
[κ]αὶ ἐμ πολλοῖς [[. . . .]] εὔνοιαν καὶ καλο[καγαθίαν - - -]
κῶς προσεκαλέσατο καὶ τοῦτον ὁ [δῆμος εἰς τὸν τῆς]
[π]ατρίδος ἀγῶνα ὃς καὶ δι[ὰ] παντὸς - - - - - - - -
[ὑ]πὲ[ρ] τοῦ δήμου καὶ τότε προσκλη[θεὶς οὐκ ἐξέκλινεν τὸν]
15 κίνδυνον ὄντα οὐ μικρὸν τῶι μὴ μό[νον - - - - - - - - - -]
[κίν]δυνον εἶναι, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ τι[μ- - - - - - -]

1. See Hansen[2] (p. 122), who clearly accepts Polybios's interpretation: "This Roman mission was not trying to make peace but was actually intriguing with the Gauls against the Pergamenes."

[π]οιήcαcθαι, Μυλαcεῖc τιμηcάμενοι ἀρ[γυρίου - - - - -]
- - μὴ ταλάντων Ἀττικῶν πεντήκο[ντα - - - - - - - - - -]
[- - δ]ήμου ἐπηγγείλατο ἐγδημ[ή]c[ειν - - - - - - - - - -]
ν αὐτεφόδιος cυνηγορήcει[ν - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
ε καὶ αὐτοὶ εἰc Ῥοδίων π[όλιν - - - - - - - - - - προcε]-
φέρετο ὑπὲρ τῶν τοῦ δή[μου cυμφερόντων - - - - - - - -]
[δι]καcτηρίωι ὑπὸ Ῥοδίων Π[- - - - - - - - - - - - εὐη]-
[μ]ερήματός τε κατεcτη- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
νιων τῶν Ῥοδ[ίων - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - προcε]-
νέγκατο [πᾶcαν cπουδήν - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
IN- -

3: [διε]τέλεcεν τὴν πρεcβείαν: Hula/Szanto. || 7: οντας: Hula/Szanto. || 9: [διετέ]λεcαν: Hula/Szanto. || 10: ΟΔΙΟΙ: Hula/Szanto. || 11: πολλο[ῖ]c [εὔ]νοιαν: Hula/Szanto. || 16: ἀπὸ τουτι: Hula/Szanto. || 18: [?τι]μὴ: Hula/Szanto. || 21: αὐτὸc: Hula/Szanto. || 24: χρήματος ἑκατοcτῆ[c]: Hula/Szanto.

This inscription is a fragment of an honorary decree for an unknown individual; its discovery in the region of Euromos suggests that it was promulgated by that little state. The extant portion of the inscription deals with the diplomatic services that this man performed at a time when Euromos and Mylasa had a dispute of some degree of bitterness between them. This dispute was submitted to the judgement of the Rhodians, perhaps through the offices of a Roman official (lines 8, 10); the person honoured by this decree defended his state, apparently successfully, at the trial. The references to the risk Euromos was facing, and the hefty fine that Mylasa may have been claiming (50 talents?), underline the vital importance of the Euroman advocate's services to his state. As with most honorary decrees, his general zeal and goodwill are highly extolled in the conventional way; but this individual may truly have gone above and beyond the call of duty in defraying the costs of his journey to Rhodes himself (αὐτεφόδιος, line 20).

The nature of the dispute between Euromos and Mylasa cannot be determined from the inscription itself. Perhaps the Rhodian arbitration is to be connected to certain events or relationships between the two states already known from other testimonia. One possibility is to place the judicial wrangling between Mylasa and Euromos in the context of a sympolity between the two.[1] Robert suggested that in the aftermath of the breakdown of this sympolity, the two states could have required a third-party settlement of their rival claims and disputes. Since the sympolity has been dated by Blümel to the first half of the first century B.C., it follows that the arbitration would be later still.

But there is no compelling reason to connect the arbitration with the sympolity, and another possibility exists for a Rhodian intervention between

1. *IMylasa* 102.

Mylasa and Euromos. In 167, Mylasa invaded the territory of Euromos and was obliged to retreat only in the face of a Rhodian military expedition (Polyb. 30.5.11–15; Livy 45.25.11–13). This conflict between Mylasa and Euromos may have been only the active expression of hostilities already existing. If the Euroman advocate was indeed successful in gaining the upper hand in the arbitration, then the Mylasans may have chosen this method of redress. The Rhodians would have had an interest in taking action against Mylasa, not only as arbitrators of the dispute and perhaps guarantors of its resolution but also in order to reaffirm their own political and military sovereignty in Caria.[2]

125. Chalkis arbitrates a land dispute between Erythrai and Hypata (between 167 and 146?)

A small marble stele, inscribed on both sides (I and II), found at Hypata; now lost.

H. G. Lolling, *MDAI(A)* 4 (1879) pp. 206–17, no. 1; Fick, *SGDI* 1432; Berard 24; *A. Wilhelm, *JÖAI* 8 (1905) pp. 285f.; Kern, *IG* IX.2.7 and *add.* p. viii.

Sonne 22; Wilhelm, *Neue Beiträge* 1, p. 28; Raeder 69; Tod 30; Steinwenter, p. 183 n. 1.

I: The findings of the arbitrators

Πόλει Ἐρυθρηίων καὶ τᾶι ἀπο[δ]ίκωι πό-
λει Ὑπαταίων περὶ τᾶς δίκας ἃς ἐξε-
δίκησαν ὄρεος τοῦ ἐκ τᾶς Χάας ἐπ[ὶ]
τὰν δέραν . . . . . ΑΝΔΕΚΑΒΙΑΣ ἔ-
5 κριναν οἱ δικασταὶ καθὼς οἱ προδικέ-
οντες ὑπὲρ ἑκ[α]τερᾶν τᾶν πολίω[ν]
σύμφωνοι γενόμενοι ἐκέλευς[αν]
καταγράψαι τὸ κρίμα· ἀπολελυμ[έναν]
εἶμεν τὰμ πόλιν τῶν Ὑπαταίω[ν τοῦ]
10 ἐνκλήματος καὶ τὸ ὄρος Πεν[. . . . ἐπί]-
κλην τᾶς πόλιος τῶν Ὑπατ[αίων εἶμεν]

2. Of course, revolts, uprisings, and general military activity in Caria at this time are also to be connected to the contemporary Roman pronouncements about the status of Lycia and Caria. Given the subsequent chilliness in Roman-Rhodian relations, if a Roman official (the στρατηγός of line 8?) was involved in any way in passing on the task of arbitration to Rhodes, it might be more appropriate to situate such a request in the period before 167, rather than in subsequent years.

Mylasa and Euromos. In 167, Mylasa invaded the territory of Euromos and was obliged to retreat only in the face of a Rhodian military expedition (Polyb. 30.5.11–15; Livy 45.25.11–13). This conflict between Mylasa and Euromos may have been only the active expression of hostilities already existing. If the Euroman advocate was indeed successful in gaining the upper hand in the arbitration, then the Mylasans may have chosen this method of redress. The Rhodians would have had an interest in taking action against Mylasa, not only as arbitrators of the dispute and perhaps guarantors of its resolution but also in order to reaffirm their own political and military sovereignty in Caria.[2]

125. Chalkis arbitrates a land dispute between Erythrai and Hypata (between 167 and 146?)

A small marble stele, inscribed on both sides (I and II), found at Hypata; now lost.

H. G. Lolling, *MDAI(A)* 4 (1879) pp. 206–17, no. 1; Fick, *SGDI* 1432; Berard 24; *A. Wilhelm, *JÖAI* 8 (1905) pp. 285f.; Kern, *IG* IX.2.7 and *add.* p. viii.

Sonne 22; Wilhelm, *Neue Beiträge* 1, p. 28; Raeder 69; Tod 30; Steinwenter, p. 183 n. 1.

I: The findings of the arbitrators

Πόλει Ἐρυθρηίων καὶ τᾶι ἀπο[δ]ίκωι πό-
λει Ὑπαταίων περὶ τᾶς δίκας ἃς ἐξε-
δίκησαν ὄρεος τοῦ ἐκ τᾶς Χάας ἐπ[ὶ]
τὰν δέραν . . . . . ΑΝΔΕΚΑΒΙΑΣ ἔ-
5 κριναν οἱ δικασταὶ καθὼς οἱ προδικέ-
οντες ὑπὲρ ἑκ[α]τερᾶν τᾶν πολίω[ν]
σύμφωνοι γενόμενοι ἐκέλευς[αν]
καταγράψαι τὸ κρίμα· ἀπολελυμ[έναν]
εἶμεν τὰμ πόλιν τῶν Ὑπαταίω[ν τοῦ]
10 ἐνκλήματος καὶ τὸ ὄρος Πεν[. . . . ἐπί]-
κλην τᾶς πόλιος τῶν Ὑπατ[αίων εἶμεν]

2. Of course, revolts, uprisings, and general military activity in Caria at this time are also to be connected to the contemporary Roman pronouncements about the status of Lycia and Caria. Given the subsequent chilliness in Roman-Rhodian relations, if a Roman official (the στρατηγός of line 8?) was involved in any way in passing on the task of arbitration to Rhodes, it might be more appropriate to situate such a request in the period before 167, rather than in subsequent years.

καὶ ὅca ἐκ τοῦ [ἐνκλήματος τούτου γέ]-
γονεν ἀδικήμα[τα Ὑπαταίοις καὶ]
Ἐρυθρηίοις πὸ[τ ἀλλάλους λελύcθαι?]
τά τε ὑπογραφ[έντα κρίματα ἀνα]-
γράψα[ι?] ἐ- - - - - - - - - - -

1: [ἔκριναν Οἰχαλιήων οἱ δικασταὶ τᾶι]| πόλει Ἐρυθρήιων κτλ.: Hiller von Gaertringen (*IG*). || 4–5: τὰν Δέραν [καὶ περὶ τ]ᾶν δ[ι]κᾶ[ν] ᾆ[ν] ἔ|κριναν: Hiller von Gaertringen (*IG*). [Οἰχαλ]ίας ἔ|κριναν: Lolling, Fick, Berard. || 6: ἐκ[α]τέρα[c]: Lolling, Fick, Berard, Kern. || 10–11: τὸ ὅροc πε[ρὶ οὗ ἃ δί]|κα [ἦν]: Hiller von Gaertringen (*IG*). || 15–16: τά τε ὑπογραφ[όμενα ὀνόματα ἐc τὰ ἀντί]|γρα[φ]α τε[θῆναι . . .]: Hiller von Gaertringen (*IG*).

II: List of judges and advocates

Αἰνιαρχεόντων Ἀcκλαπιάδα Διώ-
ξου Ἀγεμάχου Ἀριστονόου Ἀλε-
[ξι]μάχου, ἐν δὲ Ὑπάται ἀρχόντων
[. . . . Ἀθ]ανάδα Πολεμάρχου Δαμ[ί]-
[ων]oc?· κρίματα ἃ ἔκριναν οἱ Χαλ[κι]-
[δεῖ]c δικασταὶ Νικοκλῆc Πολιά-
[γρου], Cώcτρατoc Μοιρίχου, Ἀμε[ι]-
[νοκλῆ]c Ἀνδροcθένου, Φοργίας
. . . . . ., Ἀριστόδαμος Ἀριστίωνο[c]
- - - - - -ων καὶ τοῖc ἐκδικαζομέ-
[νοις - - - - Ὁ]νομάρχωι καὶ τοῖc α-
- - - - - - - -ΑΙΑΙΜΥ/[.]Ν καὶ Πραξ[ι]-
[- - - - - - - τ]οῖc Κράτωνος, Νικε-
[- - - - - - - - - Δ]ικαιάρχου, Δαμο-
- - - - - - - - - - -ου, Cτρατάγωι
- - - - - - - - - - -cίωνος, Νικοδά-
[μωι - - -, - - - - -]ωνι Ἀριcτα-
- - - - - - - - - - - - -τοc, Ἀν-
- - - - - - - - - - - -δάμου, Λα-
[- - - - - - - - Ἀγλ]ωνίκωι
- - - - - - - - - - - - -ου, Αὐτ-
- - - - - - - - - - - - -άχου,
- - - - - - - - - - - - - -Σ

1–2: Δίω|[νοc]: Lolling, Fick, Berard. || 5–6: κρίματα ἃ ἔκριναν Οἰχαλι|[ήων οἱ] δικασταὶ: Lolling, Fick, Berard, Kern. || 6–7: Πολιά|[γρου]: Lolling, Fick. || 8–9: Γοργίας| [Γοργίδου?]: Lolling. || Lines 10–23 are as read by Kern in *IG*. || 11–12: καὶ τοῖc ἄ|[λλοις]: Fick. || 13–14: Νικέ|[ρωτι]: Fick, Berard. || 14–15: Δαμο|[τέλει Δαμοστράτ?]ου: Lolling, Berard. || 16: [Μνα]cίωνοc: Lolling, Fick, Berard. || 17–18: [Ἀριστί]ωνι Ἀριcτα|[γόρου]: Lolling, Berard. || 19: [Εὐθ]υδάμου: Lolling, Fick, Berard.

The towns of Hypata and Erythrai in the region of Thermopylai had a quarrel over the ownership of a certain mountain, no doubt a ridge separating their respective territories, perhaps of some military significance.[1] It was long thought that this dispute was arbitrated by the Oichalians, the name restored on the stone by the first editor. However, Wilhelm's reading of the stone established the arbitrating state as Chalkis. Hypata was apparently accused by Erythrai of having usurped the territory, which was not rightfully Hypata's. Therefore Hypata was the defendant in the case and is called the ἀπόδικος πόλις. Both sides willingly accepted the arbitration of Chalkis, and the advocates of both states agreed on the procedure. Hypata was acquitted of the accusation of wrongful occupation of the disputed land, and all charges between Erythrai and Hypata were to be dropped.

The inscription was found at Hypata, and the dating of the document by the Hypatan magistrates confirms that this is the Hypatan copy of the findings of the arbitral court. It is also dated according to the "Ainiarchs," the magistrates of the Ainian federation. Neither Aitolians nor Romans appear in this inscription. It has therefore been argued that the arbitration took place at a time prior to 146, but after the end of Aitolian domination.[2] But Roman intervention in Greek disputes after 146 was not all-encompassing; a date after the destruction of Corinth for this arbitration cannot be ruled out on the grounds of the absence of Rome.

126. Boundary settlements between Delphi and its neighbours Ambryssos and Phlygonion (between c. 167 and c. 140?)

Several fragmented inscriptions from Delphi, which may be related to one another.

I: An inscription from the treasury of the Athenians.

*Colin, *FDelphes* III.2.136; Daverio Rocchi 12.4 (lines 18–33).

II: A fragment from the Athenian treasury.

Colin, *FDelphes* III.2.142; Pomtow, *Klio* 18 (1923) p. 272, no. 21; *J. Bousquet, *BCH* 66–67 (1942–43) pp. 124–25, A.

1. Tod, 57.

2. See Raeder, Sonne, Berard, and Tod. Larsen (*GFS*, p. 282) cites the Ainians as still Aitolian in 178; they became independent at some unknown date and were eventually absorbed by Thessaly. See *SIG*^{3} 653, n. 1, on the restitution of minor leagues in 167.

The towns of Hypata and Erythrai in the region of Thermopylai had a quarrel over the ownership of a certain mountain, no doubt a ridge separating their respective territories, perhaps of some military significance.[1] It was long thought that this dispute was arbitrated by the Oichalians, the name restored on the stone by the first editor. However, Wilhelm's reading of the stone established the arbitrating state as Chalkis. Hypata was apparently accused by Erythrai of having usurped the territory, which was not rightfully Hypata's. Therefore Hypata was the defendant in the case and is called the ἀπόδικος πόλις. Both sides willingly accepted the arbitration of Chalkis, and the advocates of both states agreed on the procedure. Hypata was acquitted of the accusation of wrongful occupation of the disputed land, and all charges between Erythrai and Hypata were to be dropped.

The inscription was found at Hypata, and the dating of the document by the Hypatan magistrates confirms that this is the Hypatan copy of the findings of the arbitral court. It is also dated according to the "Ainiarchs," the magistrates of the Ainian federation. Neither Aitolians nor Romans appear in this inscription. It has therefore been argued that the arbitration took place at a time prior to 146, but after the end of Aitolian domination.[2] But Roman intervention in Greek disputes after 146 was not all-encompassing; a date after the destruction of Corinth for this arbitration cannot be ruled out on the grounds of the absence of Rome.

126. Boundary settlements between Delphi and its neighbours Ambryssos and Phlygonion (between c. 167 and c. 140?)

Several fragmented inscriptions from Delphi, which may be related to one another.

I: An inscription from the treasury of the Athenians.

*Colin, *FDelphes* III.2.136; Daverio Rocchi 12.4 (lines 18–33).

II: A fragment from the Athenian treasury.

Colin, *FDelphes* III.2.142; Pomtow, *Klio* 18 (1923) p. 272, no. 21; *J. Bousquet, *BCH* 66–67 (1942–43) pp. 124–25, A.

1. Tod, 57.

2. See Raeder, Sonne, Berard, and Tod. Larsen (*GFS*, p. 282) cites the Ainians as still Aitolian in 178; they became independent at some unknown date and were eventually absorbed by Thessaly. See *SIG*^{3} 653, n. 1, on the restitution of minor leagues in 167.

III: A fragment from the column of Eumenes II.

B. Haussoullier, *BCH* 5 (1881) p. 387; Pomtow, *Klio* 18 (1923) 23; *SEG* II.266; G. Daux, *Mélanges G. Glotz* (Paris, 1932) vol. 1, p. 291; id., ***FDelphes*** III.3.243.

IV: Some other inscriptions and fragments from Delphi, which may be related to this arbitration.

Pomtow, *Klio* 18 (1923) pp. 272–75, nos. 22, 24–26; *SEG* II.265, 267–68.

Tod 25; H. Pomtow, *Klio* 16 (1919) p. 139–41; Daux, *Delphes,* pp. 234f., 479f.; Robert, *REG* 1943, 32; L. Robert, *Études anatoliennes* (Amsterdam, 1970) pp. 109–10; Daverio Rocchi, pp. 132–42.

I: Boundary arbitration from the Athenian treasury

Θ ε ό c. [τ] ύ χ α ν ἀ γ α θ ά ν.
[lines 2–17 almost completely destroyed; see IV.25 below]
τὸ [καλ]ούμε[ν]ον Δε . . . ιcc . . . 13 . . . έων, τὰ δ[ὲ]
[εὐώ]νυμα, ὡc ὕδωρ ῥεῖ, εἶναι Δ[ελφῶν] ἕ[ωc Α]ἰγωνείας.
[ἀπὸ] δὲ Αἰγωνείας, ὡc ὕδωρ ῥεῖ, δι[ὰ τῆ]c [χαρ]άδρας· τὸν
[λ]όφον τὸν καλούμενον Κέρδωνα [ἕως τῆ]c ὁδοῦ
[τ]ῆc ἐπὶ τὸν πρῖνον φερούcηc· τὰ δέ[ξια εἶν]αι Φλυγο-
[ν]έων καὶ Ἀμβρυccέων, τὰ δὲ εὐώνυμ[α εἶναι] Δελφῶν.
[ἀ]πὸ δὲ τῆc ὁδοῦ ἐπὶ τὸμ πρῖνον τὸν ἐ[πὶ τοῦ] Κατο-
πτηρίου· ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ Κατοπτηρίου εἰc ὀ[ρθὸν κ]ατὰ
ῥάχιν ἐπὶ τὸν Ὀξὺν λίθον· ἀπὸ δὲ τ[οῦ Λίθου εἰ-]
c ὀρθὸν ἐπὶ τὸν Πέτραχον· ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ [Πετράχου]
εἰc ὀρθὸν ἐπὶ τὸν Παρναccόν· τούτω[ν πάντα τὰ]
πρόc ἡλίου ἀνατολὴν εἶναι Φλυγ⟨ο⟩νέ[ων καὶ Ἀμ-]
βρυccέων, τὰ δὲ πρὸc ἡλίου δύcιν εἶναι Δ[ελφῶν.]
τὸ δὲ ὕδωρ τὸ παρὰ τὴν Αἰγώνειαν ῥέον εἶνα[ι]
κοινὸν πάντων. εἰ δέ τινά ἐcτιν ἱερὰ ἐν τού-
τοιc τοῖc τόποιc, ὑπάρχειν αὐτὰ κατὰ τὰ ἐξ ἀρχῆ[c.]

II: Fragment from the Athenian treasury

- -
- -μένηc
[- - - - - - τῆc ἀμφιcβητουμένηc or κεκριμέν]ηc χώρας ὑπὸ
[- ἄρχ]οντοc ἐν Ἀθή-
[ναιc . . ., ἐν Δελφοῖc . . . . . ., ἐν] Ἀμβρύccῳ Ἰc-
[μηνία, - - - - - - - τὸ ψήφιcμα? τοῦ δήμο .] τοῦ Ἀθηναίων,
κα[ὶ τὴν ἐπιcτολὴν τὴν γραφεῖcαν ὑπὸ . . . . . .] ἀνθυπάτου καὶ τὴν
Λευκίο[υ - - - - - - - ἀναγράψαι παρ]ὰ τὸ ψήφιcμα τοῦ δήμου.

III: Fragment from the column of Eumenes

Ἔδοξε τᾶι πόλει τῶν Δελφῶν ἐν ἀγορᾶι τελ[είω]ι σὺμ ψάφοις ταῖς ἐννόμοις· ἐπειδὴ [οἱ]
ἀποσταλέντες πρεσβευταὶ ποτὶ Ἀθηναίους . . . εσασθαι δικαστήριον ἐπὶ τὰν κρίσιν π . .
. . . c. 11 . . . ΕΙΣ . . . c. 12–13 . . . Ἐ[μμ]ε[νίδας Κα]λλία, Εὔδοκο[c] Πραξία, Ἀντιγένη[c] Δι[οδώ-]
[ρου . . c. 23 . .]ΛΕ . . c. 15 . . ΛΓΟΔ . . ΙΟΣΘΛΙ . Ι . ΣΘΕ . ΦΙ . . c. 5–6 . .

2: [αἰ]τ⟨ή⟩σασθαι or [καλ]έσασθαι: suggested by Daux. || 2–3: τὰν κρίσιν π[οτὶ τοὺς Φλυγον]εῖς [καὶ Ἀμβρυσσεῖς]: suggested by Daux.

IV: Pomtow's fragments (*Klio* 18 [1923] 22, 24–26)

22: a proxeny decree for an Athenian (*FDelphes* III.2.91), from the year 167, connected by Pomtow with the Athenian judges.

24: a fragment of an Athenian letter concerning a Delphian embassy, from the year 167.

24a: a letter from Delphi regarding an Athenian embassy (*FDelphes* III.2.94).

25: the publication of the Athenian arbitral court, edited by Pomtow (cf. *SEG* II.267); these are the extremely small fragments from the missing lines 2–17 of document I, published in uppercase by Colin (*FDelphes* III.2, p. 141):

- - - - -ου- - - - -ατ- - - - -
[- - - ἄρ]χον[τος - - - -] ἐγέν[οντο]
- - - - -οι- - - - ὑπὸ τ- - - - - -
[- - - κρ]ίμα [- - - - ἀ]μῖν τ- - - -
5 [- - Ἀμβρυ]σσ[έων - - ἄ]ρχον[τος - - -]
- - - - ἄρχ[οντος - - - ἐν Δε]λφοῖς - - -
[- - ἐν Ἀμβρύσ]σω[ι - - - ἀ]ρχο[ντος - - -]

26: Roman confirmation of the Athenian arbitral award, from about 167 (cf. *SEG* II.265):

[- - ὁρ]ο̣θεσίαν - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -Σ- - - - -
- - - - μεταξὺ Δελφῶν καὶ Ἀμβρο̣[σσέων - - -]τε̣σθαι ἐ- - -
[πρὸς] τ̣[ῶ̣] συμβου[λ]ίῳ ἐγένοντο [οἱ πρεσβευταὶ Δελφῶν] κα[ὶ] Ἀμβροσ[σέων]
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -νου α- - -εριον ιο- - - - -
5 [- - - - - - - - - - - -ἔ]σ̣τησε - τις τὸν ἐ- - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -ου- - - - - - -

The following fragment may belong to the same inscription:

- - - γε - - -|- - - οὔτε - - -|- - - ὥστε̣ - - -|[τῆς ὁρο]θεσίας - - -

Delphi's border disputes were not restricted to its western neighbour, Lokrian Amphissa.[1] The land to the east of Delphi was also claimed by Delphi's eastern neighbours in Phokis, Ambryssos and Phlygonion.[2] The first document in this series records a boundary delineation between Delphi and the two towns to the east. A clear boundary line is drawn between Delphian territory, on the one side, and Ambryssian and Phlygonian territory, on the other. It is specified, however, that the river that forms part of this border is to be the common property of all parties. Provision is also made for the ancestral jurisdiction of any temples that might lie in the disputed lands. Perhaps the fact of a boundary arbitration between Delphi on the one side and Ambryssos and Phlygonion on the other indicates a partial synoikism between the latter two.[3] The document was inscribed on the Treasury of the Athenians at Delphi, a fact that suggests that the Athenians acted as arbitrators.

Little remains of the second inscription (II), which is of the same provenance; nevertheless it may be related to the boundary arbitration documented in the first inscription. The names of both Athens and Ambryssos appear, as does the title of a Roman proconsul (ἀνθύπατος). Perhaps this is a fragment of an original decree or letter that dealt with a Roman request to Athens to arbitrate the dispute. The third document is a decree of the city of Delphi. It refers to the dispatch of ambassadors to Athens to request an arbitral court. Daux suggested that the names of Ambryssos and Phlygonion could be restored to this decree, thereby relating it as well to this particular case.

Pomtow dated this arbitration and the various documents he believed to be connected with it to 167 B.C., after the end of the Third Macedonian War, and identified the proconsul mentioned in document II with Aemilius Paullus. Other editors have not been so precise in their conjectures. Colin dated the events to around the middle of the second century, as did Daux.[4]

127. Magnesia offers to mediate between Gortyn and Knossos (before 167?)

Two decrees, one of Gortyn (I) and one of Knossos (II), inscribed in the west portico of the agora at Magnesia in Asia Minor.

I: No dimensions given.

1. See **1**, **22**, **88**, **117**, **163**.

2. Not to be confused with the Lokrian Plygonians (cf. **88**). See Daux, *Delphes,* p. 234; J. M. Fossey, *The Ancient Topography of Eastern Phokis* (Amsterdam, 1986), p. 55.

3. Daux, *Delphes*; Colin, *FDelphes* III.2, p. 144. Cf. **30**, **31**, and **163**.

4. Daux (*Delphes,* pp. 479–80) used the prosopographical evidence of document III to arrive at termini of c. 160–135.

Delphi's border disputes were not restricted to its western neighbour, Lokrian Amphissa.[1] The land to the east of Delphi was also claimed by Delphi's eastern neighbours in Phokis, Ambryssos and Phlygonion.[2] The first document in this series records a boundary delineation between Delphi and the two towns to the east. A clear boundary line is drawn between Delphian territory, on the one side, and Ambryssian and Phlygonian territory, on the other. It is specified, however, that the river that forms part of this border is to be the common property of all parties. Provision is also made for the ancestral jurisdiction of any temples that might lie in the disputed lands. Perhaps the fact of a boundary arbitration between Delphi on the one side and Ambryssos and Phlygonion on the other indicates a partial synoikism between the latter two.[3] The document was inscribed on the Treasury of the Athenians at Delphi, a fact that suggests that the Athenians acted as arbitrators.

Little remains of the second inscription (II), which is of the same provenance; nevertheless it may be related to the boundary arbitration documented in the first inscription. The names of both Athens and Ambryssos appear, as does the title of a Roman proconsul (ἀνθύπατος). Perhaps this is a fragment of an original decree or letter that dealt with a Roman request to Athens to arbitrate the dispute. The third document is a decree of the city of Delphi. It refers to the dispatch of ambassadors to Athens to request an arbitral court. Daux suggested that the names of Ambryssos and Phlygonion could be restored to this decree, thereby relating it as well to this particular case.

Pomtow dated this arbitration and the various documents he believed to be connected with it to 167 B.C., after the end of the Third Macedonian War, and identified the proconsul mentioned in document II with Aemilius Paullus. Other editors have not been so precise in their conjectures. Colin dated the events to around the middle of the second century, as did Daux.[4]

127. Magnesia offers to mediate between Gortyn and Knossos (before 167?)

Two decrees, one of Gortyn (I) and one of Knossos (II), inscribed in the west portico of the agora at Magnesia in Asia Minor.

I: No dimensions given.

1. See **1**, **22**, **88**, **117**, **163**.

2. Not to be confused with the Lokrian Plygonians (cf. **88**). See Daux, *Delphes,* p. 234; J. M. Fossey, *The Ancient Topography of Eastern Phokis* (Amsterdam, 1986), p. 55.

3. Daux, *Delphes*; Colin, *FDelphes* III.2, p. 144. Cf. **30**, **31**, and **163**.

4. Daux (*Delphes,* pp. 479–80) used the prosopographical evidence of document III to arrive at termini of c. 160–135.

Kern, *IMagM* 65a, 75; Blass, *SGDI* 5153; P. Deiters, *RhM* 59 (1904) pp. 565–79; *Guarducci, *IC* IV, pp. 246–48, no. 176.

II: No dimensions given.

Kern, *IMagM* 65b, 76; Blass, *SGDI* 5154; P. Deiters, *RhM* 59 (1904) pp. 565–79; *Guarducci, *IC* I.viii, pp. 63–65, no. 9.

G. Cardinali, *RFC* 33 (1905) p. 549; A. Wilhelm, *BCH* 29 (1905) p. 577; G. Cardinali, *RFC* 35 (1907) pp. 1f.; Wilhelm, *Attische Urkunden*, pp. 53f.; Raeder 44; F. Mezger, "Inscriptio Milesiaca" (Diss., Munich, 1913) pp. 33f., 53; Tod 49; A. Rehm, *Milet* I.3, pp. 201f.; P. Roussel, *REG* 27 (1914) p. 467; Muttelsee, pp. 11, 17, 51; M. van der Mijnsbrugge, *The Cretan Koinon* (New York, 1931) pp. 163f.; M. Guarducci, *Historia* 8 (1934) pp. 64f.; Heuss, p. 144; van Effenterre, pp. 216, 260f.; Holleaux, *Études*, vol. 4, p. 174; R. F. Willets, *Aristocratic Society in Ancient Crete* (London, 1955) pp. 145–46, 236–37; Klose, pp. 111, 146; P. Brulé, *La piraterie crétoise hellénistique* (Paris, 1978) pp. 165f.; A. Chaniotis, *Historie und Historiker in den griechischen Inschriften* (Stuttgart, 1988) pp. 38–39, 113–15, 247, 273, 355–56; Ager, *JHS* 114 (1994) pp. 1–18.

I: The decree of Gortyn

- -
- - - - - - - - -αι- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - -ε- - - -α- - - - - - - - - - -
. ολ . . . c καὶ μετὰ α- - - - - - - - - - - - - -
χῆς [κ]ατὰ . [τ]ῆς κατοικο[- - - - - - - - δια]-
λύοντες [αὐ]τοὺς διαφε[ρ - - - - - - - - - -]
τὸ cυμφέρον καθιστάν[τες, καὶ πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἀπο]-
στείλαντες ψάφιcμα καὶ [πρεcβευτὰς ἀξι]-
οῦcιν διαλυcαμένους [τὸν πόλεμον τὸν]
πρὸς Κνωcίους ἄραι ἀποκ[ατασταθῆναί τε]
εἰς φιλίαν καὶ τοῖς ἀγαθο[ῖc - - - - - - -]
καὶ φι(λ)άνθρωπα περὶ τῶν [κοινᾶι cυμφερόντων]
πᾶcιν Κρηταιεῦcιν διελέγ[ηcαν ἐᾶν αὐτοὺc]
ἐλευθέρους ὄντας καὶ [ἀζαμίους ἐν τᾶι δα]-
μοκρατίαι πολιτεύεcθαι - - - - - - - - - - -
ἀποκρίνacθαι αὐτοῖc ὅτ[ι Γ]ο[ρ]τυνίω[ν ἁ πό]-
λιc τὰμ μὲν Μαγνήτων πό[λι]ν - - - - - - - -
ὅτι ποιεῖ ἃ δεῖ τοὺc φίλου[c Κρη]cὶν καὶ [ο]ἰ[κεί]-
ουc καὶ τοὺc παραγενομέ[νο]υc πρε[cβευ]-
τὰc ἐπαινοῦμεν [. . . . . ον Μικίωνος, Χαρί]-
cιον Νικομάχ(ω) τῶ Νικα- - - - - - - - ὅτ[ι εὖ]
διελέγηcαν περί τε τῶν ἐξ [ἀρχ]ᾶc ὑπ[αρχ]όντων
Γορτυνίοις καὶ Μάγν[ηc]ι [φιλαν]θρώπων καὶ ὅca
ἐνεδέχετο ἔπραccον ὑπὲ[ρ τᾶc] ἰ[ρήνα]c, καὶ οὐ-
[θ]ὲν ὑπέλειπον τᾶc [φι]λοτιμ[ία]c οὔθ' ὁδὸν οὔτε

25 κακοπαθίαν ἔργοντες, ὅσα συ[μφ]έροντα καὶ
τᾶι Κρήτ[α]ι καὶ Μαγνησία[ι ἔ]σονται. π]ερὶ ὧν δὲ
Γορτύνιοι καὶ Κνώσιοι διαφέ[ρονται, βασιλ]εῖ Πτο-
λεμαίωι κριτᾶι ἐπιτραπόμ[εθα, ὅπως ἁμῖν] περὶ
τούτων διαλάβηι. διαλεχθέ[ντων δὲ τῶν πρες]-
30 βευτῶν καὶ περὶ τῶν Κρηταί[έων τῶν εἰς Μίλητον]
ἀποικιζομένων, ἔδοξεν [Γορτυνίων τοῖς κόρ]-
μοις καὶ τᾶι [πόλει· ὅσοι ἐμ Μι[λήτωι Γορτύνιοι]
ὄντες μετῴ[κη]σαν εἰς Μίλ[ητον ἢ - - - - - -]
αν ἢ ἄλλω[ς, εἶμ]εν Γορτυνίο[υς, ὅσοι δὲ πολι]-
35 τεύουσιν ἐμ Μιλήτωι, μὴ εἶμεν [ἐπάνοδον εἰς]
τὰν ἰδίαν, ἀλλὰ τὰ ὑπάρχον[τα αὐτοῖς εἶμεν δα]-
μόσια καὶ εἶμεν αὐτοῖς τὰ ἐπ[ιτίμια ἅπερ τοῖς ἐπὶ]
τὰν ἰδίαν στρατευσαμένοις [- - - - - - - - - πε]-
δὰ Γορτυνίων [ἐκκ]λησίαν, δ[εδόχθαι τὰ ψαφίς]-
40 ματα ἀποστεῖλαι πρός τε Μιλ[ησίους καὶ πρὸς]
[το]ὺς μετελθόντας εἰς Μίλητ[ον - - - - - - -]
- -

5: διαφε[ρομένους]: Kern. [τε] τοὺς διαφε[ρομένους]: Blass. || 5–6: διαφε[ρομένους καὶ ἐς?]| τὸ συμφέρον: Deiters. || 8–10: διαλυσαμένους [τὰν διαφορὰν τὰν or τὸν πόλεμον τὸν]| πρὸς Κνωσίους ἄραι ἀποκ[ατασταθῆναί τε]| εἰς φιλίαν: Wilhelm, *BCH* 29. || 9: αριον ἀποκ[ατασταῖσαι?]: Kern. αριον-αποκ: Blass. αριον? ἀποκ[αθίστασθαι? αὐτοῖς]: Deiters. || 11: The stone reads ΦΙΜ. περὶ τῶν [συμφερόντων]: Blass. περὶ τῶν [ἐχθίστων? τοῖς]: Deiters. || 13: ἐλευθερούσοντας: Kern. || 14: πολιτεύεσθαι [κατὰ τὰ πάτρια]: Deiters. || 15: ὅτ[ι Γορτυνίων οἱ κόρμοι καὶ ἁ πό]|λις: Kern, Blass. || 16: πό[λιν ἐπαινέοντι]: Kern. [ἐπαινίοντι]: Blass. || 16–17: [δι]|ότι: Kern, Blass. || 17: φίλου[ς καὶ συγγενεῖς καὶ οἰκεί]|ους: Kern, Blass. || 18: παραγενομέ[νους δὲ ποτ' ἀμὲ πρεσβευ]|τὰς: Kern. || 19: Λεύ[κιππον Μιχίωνος]: Kern, Blass. || 21: περὶ τού[τ]ων ἑκά[στων καὶ περὶ τᾶς ὑπαρχούσας]: Kern, Blass. || 22: Μάγν[ης]ι[ν συγγενείας καὶ ὅσαν]: Kern. [συγγενείας, καὶ ὅσα]: Blass. || 23: ἔπρασσον ἐπει- -: Kern, Blass. || 24–25: [οὐδεμίαν]| κακοπαθίαν: Blass. || 27: διαφερ[όμενοι καὶ βασιλεῖ]: Kern. || 28: ἐπιτραπόμ[ενοι]: Kern, Blass. || 32: ἐμ Μι[λήτωι Κρηταιεῖς]: Deiters. || 33: εἰς Μιλ[ησίων]: Kern. || 33–34: [εὔνοι?]|αν ἢ ἄλλως: Deiters. [ἢ κατὰ πρόνοι?]|αν: Wilhelm, *Attische Urkunden*. || 34: ἄλλως: Kern, Blass. || 34–35: [ἐν μ]ὲν Γόρτυνι ὄ[ντες, οἳ δὲ νῦν πολι]|τεύουσιν: Deiters. [τοῖς πολι]|τεύουσιν: Kern, Blass. || 35: μὴ εἶμε[ν ἐπανελθεῖν]: Deiters. || 36: ὑπάρχον[τα αὐτοῖς ἐν Γόρτυνι]: Kern, Blass. || 37: [καθάπερ ἐπὶ]: Deiters. || 37–38: [τοῖς ποτὶ]| τὰν ἰδίαν: Kern. || 40–41: [καὶ Γορτυνίων| το]ὺς μετελθόντας: Kern, Blass.

II: The decree of Knossos

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -δια
- - - - - - - - - - -αιαν καὶ οἱ παρα-
- - - - - - - - - - -αν . . . παρ . . . . . .

[- - - - - - - - πολί]τας? τε εἶναι [καὶ]
[ἐᾶν αὐτοὺς ἐλ]ευθέρους ὄντας
[καὶ ἀζαμίους ἐν τᾶι] δαμοκρατίαι πολιτεύ-
[εσθαι κατὰ τὰ πάτ]ρια· ἀποκρίνασθαι αὐ-
[τοῖς δεδόχθαι τᾶι πό]λι τὰμ μὲν Μαγνήτων πόλιν
[ἐπαινεῖν διότι] ποιεῖ τε ἃ δεῖ τοὺς φίλους
[καὶ οἰκείους, καὶ τοὺς πα]ραγενομένους πρεσβευτὰς
[ἐπαινεῖν - - - -]ον Μικίωνος, Χαρίσιον Νικο-
[μάχω τῶ Νικα- -] ὡς ὅσα ἐνεδέχετο ἔπραξαν
[ὑπὲρ διαλύσιος?] καὶ οὐθὲν ὑπελείποντο φιλοτιμί-
[ας οὔθ' ὁδὸν οὔτε κα]κοπαθίαν ἔργοντες, καὶ πάντα
[διελέγηαν ὅς]α συμφέροντα καὶ τᾶι Κρήται
καὶ Μ[αγνησίαι ἔς]ονται. Κνώσιοι δὲ οὐχ' ἑκόντες
ἀλ[λ' ὑπὲρ ἀσφα]λε[ίας?] πολεμοῦντι Γορτυνίοις καὶ
ΝΥ . [βωλ]όμεν[οι κ]αὶ εἰρήναν ἄγειν ποτ' αὐτούς.
διὰ [ταῦτα? Γορτυνίων οἱ] σύμμαχοι καὶ Κνωσίῳ
κο[ινᾶι διαδι]κα[ζό]ντων ὧν ἕνεκα ἀναγκαζόμε-
[νοι πολεμέομεν Γορτ]υνίοις. οὕτω γὰρ ὑπολαμβάνο-
[μεν ἁμὶν τάχιστ'] ἂν γενέσθαι τὰν διάλυσιν. δια-
[λεχθέντων δὲ] τῶν πρεσβευτᾶν καὶ περὶ τῶν
[Κρηταιέων τῶν ἀπ]οικιζομένων εἰς Μίλητον, ἔδο-
[ξε Κνωσίων τοῖς] κό[ς]μοις καὶ τᾶι πόλει· ὅσοι ἐκ
[Κνωσοῦ Κνώς]ιοι [ὄν]τες μετωικήκασιν εἰς
[Μίλητον ἢ κατὰ πρό]νοιαν? ἢ ἄλλως πως Κνω-
[σίους εἶμεν· ὅσοι δὲ πο]λιτεύουσιν ἐμ Μιλήτωι,
[μὴ εἶμεν ἐπάνοδον εἰ]ς τὰν ἰδίαν, ἀλλὰ τὰ
[ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῖς εἶμεν δα]μ[ό]σια καὶ [ε]ἶμεν [αὐ]-
[τοῖς τὰ ἐπιτίμια καθάπερ] τοῖς ἐπὶ τὰν ἰ[δίαν]
[στρατευσαμένοις -]ω . ους- - - - - - - - - - -
- -
- - - - - - - - - - - -εν ψηφίσας[θαι - - - - -]
- - - - - - - - - - - -ίοις - - - - - - - - - - -
[- - - - - - - - Ἐ]λευθερναίοις - - - - - - - - -
- -

5: [ἐλ]ευθερούσοντας: Kern. || 10: [ἐπαινεῖν δὲ καὶ τοὺς πα]ραγενομένους: Kern. [καὶ ἀπέσταλκε τοὺς πα]ραγενομένους: Blass. || 11: [Λεύκιπ]πον Μικίωνος: Kern, Blass. || 12: [καθ?]ὼς: Kern. || 14: [πᾶσαν κα]κοπαθίαν: Kern. [οὐδεμίαν κα]κοπαθίαν: Blass. || 15: [τ]ὰ συμφέροντα: Kern, Blass. || 18: [κελ]ευόμεν[οι δὲ] εἰρήναν: Kern, Blass. || 19: [Γορτύνιοι καὶ οἱ] σύμμαχοι: Kern. || 21: [ἐπολέμεον]: Kern. [ἐπολέμουν]: Blass. || 21–22: ὑπολαμβανο|[μένων αὐτῶν ταχίστ]αν: Kern. ὑπολαμβανο|[μένων αὐτῶν μάλιστ'] ἂν: Blass. || 22–23: διάλυσιν διὰ| [τῶν παρὰ Μαγνή]των πρεσβευτᾶν: Kern, Blass. || 24: [Γορτυνίων]: Kern. || 25: [Γορτυνίων]: Kern. || 26: [Γόρτυνος]: Kern. [Κρήτας Ἐλευθερν]α[ῖ]οι?: Deiters. || 27: [Μίλητον, πολῖται? .]α[. εὖ]νοιαν?: Deiters. || 27–28: Κνω|[σίοις βοηθοῦντες ἢ]: Kern. Κνω|[σοῖ ὄντες, οἳ δὲ νῦν πο]λιτεύουσιν: Deiters. || 28: [τοῖς πο]λιτεύουσιν: Kern, Blass. || 29: [μὴ ἐξεῖναι

ἐπανελθεῖν ἐ]c τ[ὰ]ν ἰδίαν: Kern. [μὴ εἶμεν ἐπανελθεῖν]: Deiters. || 30–31: [ε]ἶμεν κ[αὶ| τοῖc 'Ελευθερναίοιc καὶ] τοῖc Κα[ν]τανίοιc: Deiters. || 31: τοῖc [Γορτυ?]νίοιc: Kern, Blass. || 34–35: [ἀκολούθωc δὲ ἔδοξ]εν ψηφίcαc|[θαι καὶ - - -]ίοιc: Kern, Blass.

These two texts, both thought by the original editor, Kern, to be decrees of Gortyn, are in fact decrees from Gortyn (I) and Knossos (II) pertaining to the same event, the arrival of mediators from the state of Magnesia on the Maiander. The Magnesian ambassadors, one Charisios and his companion, the son of Mikion, had a double mandate. They were interested in promoting peace between the two warring Cretan states, and they also wished to intervene on behalf of Cretan colonists in Miletos. Both Gortyn and Knossos praised the Magnesians excessively for their concern but were less forthcoming when it came to accepting the Magnesian advice. Magnesia evidently desired not only Gortyn and Knossos but probably a variety of other Cretan states as well, to take back those citizens who had gone to Miletos decades before. The decrees of these two Cretan states show that this wish was not completely fulfilled, as Knossos and Gortyn refused to accept in toto the Magnesian proposals regarding the colonists. Moreover, the ambassadors evidently failed to persuade the combatants to accept Magnesian arbitration at this time.

The Magnesian concern over the Cretan colonists at Miletos, some of them obviously from Knossos and Gortyn, helps in establishing the context of these inscriptions.[1] When the first Cretan colonists arrived in Miletos in 228/7 they came as mercenary or auxiliary troops to provide military aid for that state, perhaps in a conflict between Miletos and Magnesia. The land they were given was situated in the territory of Myos, the region that Philip V took away from Miletos and transferred to his friend Magnesia in 201 (Polyb. 16.24.9). This act may have contributed to the war that was later fought by Miletos and Magnesia. At the end of this war, settled by arbitration sometime in the later part of the 180s (**109**), the territory disputed by the two states was divided between them. As a result, Magnesia doubtless now owned territory cultivated by Cretan colonists to whom it did not feel any necessary obligation for past services rendered. Accordingly, the embassies to Knossos, Gortyn, and probably other Cretan states would have had as their primary function to persuade the Cretans to take back their erstwhile citizens. In this they were not fully successful, as the Gortynians and Knossians agreed only to reintegrate a limited group of the Cretan colonists from Miletos.

Self-interest motivated the Magnesian efforts to have the Cretans repatriated; a similar motive lay behind the other part of the Magnesian mandate, the settlement of the conflict between Knossos and Gortyn. Their intervention on behalf

1. See Brulé, pp. 165f., for a discussion of the Cretan colonists at Miletos.

of the colonists was part of the program of achieving Cretan departure from what was now Magnesian land; and their attempt to mediate between Knossos and Gortyn may have been meant to alleviate pressures on those two states and facilitate the influx of a new population. The goodwill resulting from mediation and arbitration was always helpful, and it is certainly evident in these decrees.[2] But in spite of all the goodwill that both the Knossians and the Gortynians evidently felt for the Magnesians, the efforts of the latter to settle the war seem to have failed, at least at this time. The inscriptions are decrees of the two states in response to the embassy, and they clearly show that the Magnesians were unsuccessful in bringing about a mutual agreement to settle the war, or to go to arbitration. The most that seems to have been achieved was a general consensus that mediation was not a bad idea. The Gortynians informed the Magnesians that they had decided to turn to an external power, Ptolemy of Egypt, as a judge in the matters that divided them and the Knossians.[3] But the Knossians made no reference to Ptolemy and argued instead that mediation would be best carried out by a common tribunal made up of the allies of both sides. It has frequently been assumed that these countersuggestions imply a Magnesian failure, and that in the wake of this failure, the Cretan states turned ultimately to Ptolemy, who managed to bring about an understanding between them. Certainly there is nothing in the Magnesian inscriptions taken by themselves that would lead us to believe that a successful arbitration was ever carried out, either by the Magnesians or by one of the Ptolemies. But independent evidence exists that may point to the second stage in the resolution of the Gortyn-Knossos conflict, a stage that did involve a successful Ptolemaic arbitration. The inscriptions cited in **128**, which have been dated to 167/6, show that Ptolemy VI did indeed arbitrate between Knossos and Gortyn. In the past, this Ptolemaic intervention had been connected with the proposals of Gortyn discussed above. But with Guarducci's downdating of the arbitration in **128** to the early 160s, and with the connection made between the present Magnesian offer to arbitrate and the resolution of the Magnesian-Milesian war, traditionally dated to 196, it was thought that the Magnesian and Ptolemaic offers were too widely separated to be connected. With the new dating for the resolution of the conflict between Magnesia and Miletos (the later 180s), it may be possible to reconnect the (failed) Magnesian offer to arbitrate between Knossos and Gortyn with the (successful) Ptolemaic settlement.

2. For the relations between Magnesia and the Cretan states, see the discussion in **58**, where evidence is cited for possible earlier Magnesian diplomatic involvement on Crete. Cf. also **158**, the later Magnesian arbitration between Itanos and Hierapytna.

3. If we are correct in dating the present documents to the years after the peace treaty between Miletos and Magnesia (see **109**), then this would be Ptolemy VI, who also provided arbitral services for Arsinoë and Troizen (**138**).

128. A Ptolemaic arbitration between Gortyn and Knossos (c. 167)

Several fragments from the same venue, the temple of Apollo at Gortyn, bearing a treaty (I) and a boundary settlement (II).

I: Two separate stones, one of which bears only the title (h: 0.588 m; w: 0.775 m); the rest of inscription I is on the other stone (h: 0.615 m; w: 0.67 m; d: 0.505 m).

F. Halbherr, *MonAL* 1 (1889) pp. 44f., B; Blass, *SGDI* 5015; *Guarducci, *IC* IV, pp. 254–59, no. 181.

II: h: 0.76 m; w: 0.8 m; d: 0.49 m.

F. Halbherr, *MonAL* 1 (1889) pp. 44f., C; Blass, *SGDI* 5016; *Guarducci *IC* IV, pp. 259–62, no. 182.

F. Dümmler, *Philologus* 54 (1895) pp. 205f.; Tod 50; M. van der Mijnsbrugge, *The Cretan Koinon* (New York, 1931) pp. 64f.; M. Guarducci, *Historia* 8 (1934) pp. 67f.; id., *Epigraphica* 7 (1945) pp. 72–87; Robert, *REG* 1948, 195; van Effenterre, p. 266; R. F. Willetts, *Aristocratic Society in Ancient Crete* (London, 1955) p. 239; P. Faure, *BCH* 82 (1958) p. 503 n. 1; Robert, *REG* 1958, 561a; id., *REG* 1960, 334; *SEG* XVIII.394; P. Faure, Κρητικὰ Χρονικά 17 (1963) pp. 22–23; id., *BCH* 89 (1965) p. 38 n. 3; Robert, *REG* 1965, 325; R. F. Willetts, *Ancient Crete: A Social History* (London and Toronto, 1965) p. 155; *SEG* XXIII.588, 590; P. Faure, Κρητικὰ Χρονικά 21 (1969) pp. 314–32; Robert, *REG* 1971, 520; Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 3, p. 447; Ager, *JHS* 114 (1994) pp. 1–18. Cf. also the citations in **127**.

I: The treaty between Knossos and Gortyn

Cυνθ[ή]κα Γορτυνίων καὶ Κνωσί[ων.]
ἀγαθᾶι θύχαι. κορμιόν[των Γόρτυνι] μὲν ἐπὶ τῶν [- - - τῶν]
cὺν Ἀρχεμάχωι τῶ Μεν[- - - - μην]ὸc Ἰονίω ἡν[άτα καὶ δεκάται, Κνω]-
coῖ δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν Παμφύλω[ν τῶν cὺν] Εὐρυθθεν[ίαι τῶ - - - μη]-
νὸc Καρνήιω ἡνάτα καὶ δ[εκάται, πρε]ιγεύcαντ[oc Πτολεμαίω βαcι]-
λέος ἐπὶ τὰν πόλιν τῶν Γορ[τυνίων π]ερὶ ἰρηνας, - - - - - -
ψαφίξανcι τρι[αx]ατίων πα[ριόντων]· πε[ρὶ] ὧν [τὸνc Γορτυνίονc παρ]-
καλίοντι Κνώc[ιοι] ἤραντας τὰν [ἐνεc]ταx[υῖαν διαφορὰν ἀποχω]-
ρῆcαι καὶ ἄγεν ἰρήναν πορτὶ Κνω[cίον]c [- - - - - - - - πε]-
δὰ βαcιλέος Πτολεμαίω ἄγεν [- - - - - - - - - - - - ἀ]-
ποκαταcτᾶcαι τᾶι Ἀθαναίαι ταιcι - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
ρον τοῖc Γορτυνίοις ἃ ἔλαβον ἰον- - - - - - - - - - - - - -
χοντα ἢ χρύcια ἢ ἀργύρια ἢ ἄλλο - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
. ἰω ἐν ἁμέραις ϝεξήκοντα, τω[- - - - - - - - - - - - εὐ]-
ρίcκηται ἰόντα τᾶι ἀλαθείαι ἢ χρύcια [ἢ ἀργύρια - - - - - -]
ναν ἐπὶ τῶν ἐφιcταμένων πεδ' Ἀρχ[εμάχω - - - - - - - -]
μων πρὸ τᾶc Λεcχανορίαc νεμο[νήιαc - - - - - - - - - ἐ]-

πὶ τῶν ἐχομένων ὡcαύτως. ἀποδό[μεν δὲ - - - τὰν Ἀπελλω]-
νίαν καὶ τὰν χώραν τὰν πορτίαθθαν κ̣α̣[ὶ - - - τῶν Ἀπελλω]-
νιατᾶν Κνωcίονc Γορτυνίοις ἐν ἀμέ[ραις - - - - - - - - - - -]
δάνεια ἢ ἐνγύανc ὀφήλει ἃ πόλις ἃ τῶν Κν[ωcίων - - Κνώcι]-
οc Γορτυνίωι ἀποδιδόντων ἐν ϝέτεθθι τ[- - - - - - - - ἢ αὐ]-
τοῖc τοῖc ὀφήλοντι ἢ τοῖc ἀντάταις ἢ αὐτοὶ ο[ἷ ὀφήλοντες ἢ οἱ ἀντᾶ]-
ται. ἄρχεν δὲ τᾶc πράτας καταβολᾶc τούτω[ν τῶν χρημάτων τὸν χρό]-
̣γον ἀφ' ὧ κ' ἀποcτᾶντι Γόρτυνι μὲν οἱ πεδ' Ἀρχε[μάχω κόρμοι ἐν τῶι ἐ]-
[πο]μένωι ἐνιαυτῶι πρό τᾶc Λεcχανορίαc νεμον[ήιαc Κνωcοῖ δὲ ἀφ' ὧ κ' ἀ-
[πο]cτᾶντι οἱ πεδ' Εὐρυθθενία κόρμοι ἐν τῶι ἐπ̣ο̣μ̣[ένωι ἐνιαυτῶι πρὸ τᾶc]
[Κ]ορωνίαc νεμονήιαc, ὡcαύτως δὲ καὶ τὰνc ἄλλαν[c καταβολάνc - - - -]
[τ]ούτων τῶ[ν] χ̣ρ̣η̣[μά]των ἐπὶ τῶν τόκ' ἀεὶ κορμιόντ[ων - -]
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -νθιχι· ων πολιτᾶν - - - - - - - -
- -

2: κορμιό[ντων ἐν μὲν Γόρτυνι τῶν]: Halbherr. || 4: τῶν Παμφύλω[ν κο-
ρμιόντων]: Halbherr. || 6: Γορ[τυνίων, ἔδοξε τοῖc κόρμοιc καὶ τᾶι πόλι]: Halb-
herr. || 7–8: πα[ριόντων - -, ὥcπερ παρ]|καλίοντι: Blass. || 8: τὰν [παρακευὰν
Γορτυνίονc πολέμω]: Halbherr. ἤραντας τὰν [διαφοράν]: Wilhelm, *BCH* 29.
|| 10–11: ἄγεν [δὲ καὶ Κνωcίονc ὡcαύτως καὶ ἀ]|ποκατακτᾶcαι: Halbherr.
[Κνωcίονc - εἰρήναν καὶ ἀ]|ποκατακτᾶcαι: Blass. || 13–14: [Πυ]|τίω: Mangana-
ro (*ap. SEG* XXIII.588). || 15–16: [ἢ ἀργύρια τὰν μὲν ἡμι]|ναν: Halbherr. || 16:
πεδ' Ἀρχ[έμαχον τὸν]: Blass. || 16–17: Ἀρχ[εμάχω τῶ Μεν . . 8 . . κόρ]|μων:
Halbherr. || 17: νεμο[νήτας, τὰν δὲ ἡμίναν]: Halbherr. || 19: κ[αὶ φρώρια?]:
Halbherr. || 20–21: [ὅθθα δὲ]| δάνεια: Halbherr. || 21–22: Κν[ωcίων ἢ πολίτας
Κνώcι]|οc: Halbherr. || 22: ϝέτεθθι τ[ριcὶ?]: Halbherr. || 28: [καταβολάνc θέμεν]:
Halbherr.

II: The boundary demarcation

- -
. λ̣οθεν ἄγονcα̣ν κ' ἀπὸ τᾶc - - - - - - - - -
. πὰρ τὰνc τῶ Φρακινίκω τῶ Καράνω c̣ . . . .
. κἄνδον καὶ ἐπὶ τὰν ἀγορὰν εὐώνυμο[ν]
[ἔ]χοντας τὸ πρυτανῆιον ἐνc ὀρθὸν ἂν [τὰν ἁ]-
μ̣αξιτὸν ἐπὶ τὰν λίμναν κ̣ἠπὶ τὰν πύλαν τὰν ἐπὶ [τὸ]-
[ν] Ἀcκαλπιὸν ἄγονcαν καὶ δίοδον ἐc τὰν δεξι[ὰν]
ἐπὶ τὸν θόλον τὸν γ⟨ω⟩νιαῖον τὸν ἐπὶ τᾶι ἄκραι κ' ἀπὸ [τῶ]
[θ]όλω κατὰ λόφον καὶ καθ' ὁδὸν κ̣ἢc τὰν νάπα[ν κ' ἃ]-
[ν] ὁδὸν κ̣ἢc τὸν ῥόον τὸν ἀπὸ Ῥιγρᾶν καταρέο[ντ]-
[α] κ' ἂν ῥόον κ̣ἠπὶ τὸν κριθθὸν κοῖλον ἐc τὰν δεξ[ιὰν]
ἃι ὕδωρ ῥεῖ ἐc τὸνc τῶν Ϝαξίων ὤρονc· τού[των]
τὰ μὲν ἐc τὸν νότον ἔχοντα μέρια Γορτυνίων [ἢ]-
μεν πάντα, τὰ δὲ ἐc τὸν βορίαν ἔχο⟨ν⟩τα μέρια Κ̣[νω]-
c̣ίων ἦμεν πάντα, τὰ̣ δ' ἐπιπόλαια πάντα κοι[νὰ ἢ]-

[μ]εν Γορτυνίων καὶ Κνωσίων, ϝεκατέρων τ[ὰν]
ἡμίναν. ἐπιτελεθθέντων δὲ τούτω[ν] πεδ[ὰ τᾶς]
τῶν θιῶν εὐνοίας, στᾶσαι τὰν ὁμολογίαν ταύ[τα]-
[ν] γράψαντανς ἐστάλ[αν] λιθίναν Γορτυνίον[ς μ]-
[ὲ]ν ἐμ Πυτίοι, Κνωσίονς δ' ἐν τῶι Δελφιδίωι χαὶ [ἄλ]-
λαν κοινᾶι τάνς πόλινς ἀμφοτέρανς ἐν Ῥι[ττ]ῆ-
[ν]ίαι ἐν τῶι ναῶι τᾶς Ἀθαναίας. – ἐπὶ τῶν Δυμάν[ων]
[κ]ορμιόντων τῶν σὺν Καρταιδάμαι τῶ Ὀνυμάρ[χω,]
[μηνὸς Ἀ]μυκλα[ί]ω δεκάται, Κνωσοῖ δ' ἐπὶ τῶν Ε . . .
[. . . ων κο]ρμιόντων τῶν σὺμ Μοψείωι τῶ Ὑπερτέρ[ω]
- - - - - -χω, μηνὸς Νεκ[υσίω], τῶν Γορτυνίων ἀπο[λα]-
[βόντων τ]ὰν Ἀπελλωνίαν παρ Κνωσίων καθ[ὼ]ς π[ρε]-
[ιγεύσαν]τες παρεκάλεσαν καὶ τῶν Κνωσίων πρε[ιγ]-
[ευσά]ντων ἐξ αὐτᾶς πορτὶ Γορτυνίονς περὶ Ἀπε[λλω]-
[νί]ας χαὶ τᾶς χώ[ρα]ς τᾶς τῶ⟨ν⟩ Ἀπελλωνία[τᾶν - - -]
- - - - -των [. . . . . ἔ]δοξε Γορτυνίοι[ς] α- - - - - - -
- -

Before line 1: [ὁδὸν τὰν]: Halbherr. || 1: τᾶς [ὁδῶ]: Halbherr. || 2–3: ς[τοὰν?|ς]: Halbherr. || 7: γ⟨ω⟩νιαῖον: Guarducci. The stone has ΓΟΝΙΑΙΟΝ. || 9: ἀπ' Ὀρυγρᾶν: Halbherr. ἀπὸ Ῥιγρᾶν: Blass. || 16–17: πεδ[ὰ πάν]|των: Halbherr. || 20–21: Ἀπελ[λο|ν]ίαι: Faure, *BCH* 82. Τιρ[ας]|ίαι: Faure, *BCH* 89. || 29–30: τῶ Ἀπελλωνία[ς τεμέν|εος?]: Halbherr.

The first inscription cited above records a treaty between Knossos and Gortyn. A Ptolemy was evidently instrumental in bringing about the peace between the two states, as it is recorded that Gortyn received a Ptolemaic embassy concerning the proposed settlement. Various items in dispute between Knossos and Gortyn were settled by the treaty, among them questions of financial debt between the two states. Another issue separating Knossos and Gortyn was the matter of territorial holdings, including the ownership of the territory of Apollonia. Under the arbitration of Ptolemy it was agreed that Knossos was to restore Apollonia to Gortyn.

The second inscription is a boundary settlement. This delineation drew a line dividing the disputed land between Knossos and Gortyn, to the south of which the land was to belong to Gortyn, while the land to the north was to be Knossian.[1] Some cooperation would have been called for in this division, as all the movable goods of the region were to be divided equally between Knossos and Gortyn. The territory of Apollonia, specified in the treaty settlement, was

1. The demarcation of the boundaries appears to run through the middle of a city or town, which Knossos and Gortyn would presumably have divided between them (lines 3f.; Blass, p. 296).

restored to Gortyn.[2] Given the appearance of Apollonia as a contentious issue in both documents, it seems clear that both the treaty and the boundary settlement are connected to the same affair, though perhaps to different stages of it. These events should postdate 171, as Apollonia was an independent state until that year, when it was taken by the Kydonians (Polyb. 28.14; Diod. 30.13). In the few years after this event, the Gortynians made war on Kydonia; it seems that the Gortynians, and subsequently the Knossians, occupied Apollonia. If we are right in connecting **127** to the present case, then the state of Magnesia may have made an effort to intervene between Gortyn and Knossos.[3] The Magnesian attempt failed, however, and it was Ptolemy VI who arbitrated the question of Apollonia and other matters unsettled between the two cities, perhaps in 168 or 167. Knossos and Gortyn, in one of their brief spates of cooperation, then undertook a common expedition against Rhaukos, which was conquered and partitioned in 167/6 (Polyb. 30.23.1). At this time the two states would have fixed their boundaries once again; the result of this delineation is our second inscription. Rhaukos may have been the community to be dissected.[4]

129. Thebes arbitrates between Boumelita and Halai (after 167?)

Two portions of the same inscription (A [fragmented] and B), discovered separately, from the Theban treasury at Delphi. See *FDelphes* and Daux, *BCH* 101, for epigraphic details.

*Bourguet, *FDelphes* III.1.362 (A); J.-P. Michaud, *Le trésor de Thèbes* (Paris, 1973) pp. 128–29, 54–55 (B); *Pouilloux, *FDelphes* III.4, 4.354 (B).

L. Robert, *BCH* 53 (1929) pp. 156–60 (= *Opera Minora* I [Paris, 1969] pp. 131–35); Robert, *REG* 1949, 81; Wilhelm, *GIRI*, pp. 47–48, no. 13; Robert, *REG* 1953, 90; *SEG* XIII.356; P. Roesch, *Thespies et la confédération béotienne* (Paris, 1965) pp. 66–67; Guarducci, *Epigrafia greca*, pp. 555–56; J. Bousquet, *BCH* 101 (1977) p. 456; G. Daux, *BCH* 101 (1977) pp. 331–34; Robert, *REG* 1977, 266; *SEG* XXVII.78; Gruen, p. 97; Daverio Rocchi, pp. 123–25, no. 10; J. Fossey, *The Ancient Topography of Opountian Lokris* (Amsterdam, 1990) pp. 45, 130, 155, 161.

2. For an examination of the sites on the plain of Mesara between Knossos and Gortyn, see I. F. Sanders, *ABSA* 71 (1976) pp. 131–38.

3. Since Guarducci and van Effenterre dated the Knossian-Gortynian conflict in **127** to the 190s, they believed it to be independent of the present Ptolemaic arbitration. But the redating of the Magnesia-Miletos treaty of **109** calls for a reassessment of their dating and argues in favour of reestablishing a connection between **127** and **128**.

4. See Guarducci, *IC*; van Effenterre; Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 3.

restored to Gortyn.[2] Given the appearance of Apollonia as a contentious issue in both documents, it seems clear that both the treaty and the boundary settlement are connected to the same affair, though perhaps to different stages of it. These events should postdate 171, as Apollonia was an independent state until that year, when it was taken by the Kydonians (Polyb. 28.14; Diod. 30.13). In the few years after this event, the Gortynians made war on Kydonia; it seems that the Gortynians, and subsequently the Knossians, occupied Apollonia. If we are right in connecting **127** to the present case, then the state of Magnesia may have made an effort to intervene between Gortyn and Knossos.[3] The Magnesian attempt failed, however, and it was Ptolemy VI who arbitrated the question of Apollonia and other matters unsettled between the two cities, perhaps in 168 or 167. Knossos and Gortyn, in one of their brief spates of cooperation, then undertook a common expedition against Rhaukos, which was conquered and partitioned in 167/6 (Polyb. 30.23.1). At this time the two states would have fixed their boundaries once again; the result of this delineation is our second inscription. Rhaukos may have been the community to be dissected.[4]

129. Thebes arbitrates between Boumelita and Halai (after 167?)

Two portions of the same inscription (A [fragmented] and B), discovered separately, from the Theban treasury at Delphi. See *FDelphes* and Daux, *BCH* 101, for epigraphic details.

*Bourguet, *FDelphes* III.1.362 (A); J.-P. Michaud, *Le trésor de Thèbes* (Paris, 1973) pp. 128–29, 54–55 (B); *Pouilloux, *FDelphes* III.4, 4.354 (B).

L. Robert, *BCH* 53 (1929) pp. 156–60 (= *Opera Minora* I [Paris, 1969] pp. 131–35); Robert, *REG* 1949, 81; Wilhelm, *GIRI*, pp. 47–48, no. 13; Robert, *REG* 1953, 90; *SEG* XIII.356; P. Roesch, *Thespies et la confédération béotienne* (Paris, 1965) pp. 66–67; Guarducci, *Epigrafia greca*, pp. 555–56; J. Bousquet, *BCH* 101 (1977) p. 456; G. Daux, *BCH* 101 (1977) pp. 331–34; Robert, *REG* 1977, 266; *SEG* XXVII.78; Gruen, p. 97; Daverio Rocchi, pp. 123–25, no. 10; J. Fossey, *The Ancient Topography of Opountian Lokris* (Amsterdam, 1990) pp. 45, 130, 155, 161.

2. For an examination of the sites on the plain of Mesara between Knossos and Gortyn, see I. F. Sanders, *ABSA* 71 (1976) pp. 131–38.

3. Since Guarducci and van Effenterre dated the Knossian-Gortynian conflict in **127** to the 190s, they believed it to be independent of the present Ptolemaic arbitration. But the redating of the Magnesia-Miletos treaty of **109** calls for a reassessment of their dating and argues in favour of reestablishing a connection between **127** and **128**.

4. See Guarducci, *IC*; van Effenterre; Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 3.

A Column I

[. . . . . ἀντ]ιγρα[φ . . . . .]
. . . . . Ο . . . . . ΕΛΛΑ . . . . . ου καὶ δημοσι . . . . . .
[. . . τῆ]ι πόλει Βου[μελιταιέ]ων καὶ τῆ πόλει Ἀλέ[ων]
[. . ἑ]κάτεροι ω[. . . . κα]τὰ τὴν κρίσιν τὴν γενο[μένην]
[ἑκ]άστων εγ . . . α . . c οὐκ ἐγενήθησαν σύμφω[ν]οι
[ἑκα]τέροις δόξηι ἐ[ξ] ἧς λαβόντες δικαστὰς ἄνδρας [. . . 18 . . . καὶ]
[ἕν]α καὶ γραμματέα καὶ ἐπαγαγόντες ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν ἀ[ποδ]είξουσι[ν ὅσους ὅρ]ους
ὑ[πά]ρχουσιν ἑκάτεροι πρότερον τεθεικότες· αἱ δὲ πόλεις ἑκατ[έραι ἀπ]οστειλάτωσαν πρεσβευτάς. τοὺς δὲ αὐτοὺς καὶ δικασταγωγοὺς ἄνδ[ρας δύο? τοὺς] αἱ-
τησομένους καὶ ἄξοντας τὸ δικαστήριον φέροντας γραπτὸν τ[. . . ἀπ]οδότω
δὲ ἑκατέρα ἡ πόλις ἀπογραφὴν τοῖς δικασταῖς ὧν πρότερον ἔθηκε[ν ὅρω]ν, εἰς ὁπο-
τέραν ἂν τὴν πόλιν πρῶτον οἱ δικασταὶ παραγένωνται, καὶ ἐφη[γησάς]θω ἑκατέ-
ρα ἡ πόλις ἐπὶ τοὺς ὅρους . . οἱ δὲ δικασταὶ παραχρῆμα κληρωσάτωσαν τὰς πό-
λεις ἑκατέρας ποτέρα προτέρα τὴν ἐφήγησιν καὶ τὴν δικαιο[. . λ]ογίαν
ποιήσεται, ἡ δὲ λαχοῦσα πρώτη ποιεί[σθ]ω· πρὸ τοῦ δὲ τὴν ἐφήγησιν μέλλειν ποιεῖσθαι τῶν δικαστῶν ἐπὶ τοὺς ὅρους, ὀμοσάτωσαν οἱ περιηγούμενοι ἐκ τοῦ συνεδρίου τοῦ παρ' ἑκατέρων ἄνδρες δέκα τὸν ὑπογεγραμμένον ὅρκον. ὅρκος· ὀμνύω Δία Ὀλύμπιον, Ἥραν, Ποσειδῶ, Ἄρη, Ἀθηνᾶν, Δήμητρα, Ἀπόλλω καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους θεοὺς πάντας καὶ πάσας
[ἐπ]άξειν τοὺς δικαστὰς ἐπὶ τοὺς ὅρους οὓς ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἦσαν τεθεικότες οἱ ἀποσταλέντες ἄνδρες ὑπὸ τῆς πόλεως ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν, ἐκτὸς δὲ τῶν ἐξ ἀρχῆς τεθέντων ὅρων μὴ ἐπιδείξειν κείμενον ὅρον μηθένα τοῖς δικασταῖς, μηδ' ἐπικατεσκευακέναι μηθένα· εὐορκοῦντι μέμ μοι εἴη πολλὰ καὶ ἀγαθά· εἰ δ' ἐφιορκοίην, ἐξώλης εἴην καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ τἀμὰ πάντα. ὀμνυ[έ]τωσαν δὲ καὶ οἱ παρ' ἑκατέ-
ρων δικασταγωγοὶ πρὸ τοῦ τὴν ἐφήγησιν ἐπὶ τοὺς ὅρους γίνεσθαι τόνδε τὸν ὅρκον. ὅρκος· ὀμνύω Δία Ὀλύμπιον, Ἥραν, Ποσειδῶ, Ἄρη, Ἀθηνᾶν, Δή-
μητρα, Ἀπόλλω καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους θεοὺς πάντας καὶ πάσας εἴ μὴν πεποιῆσθαι τὴν δικασταγωγίαν ὁσίως καὶ δικαίως καὶ μηθενὶ μεμνῆσθαι τῶν δικαστῶν μήτε τῶι γραμματεῖ μήτε τοῖς παισὶν αὐτῶν μήτε περὶ τῶν τῆς
χώρας ὁρίων {μήτε περὶ τῶν τῆς χώρας ὁρίων}μήτε περὶ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων δικαίων, μηδὲ παρακεκληκέναι καθ' ἰδίαν μηθένα, μηδὲ ἠρεισθεῦσθαι ἐπὶ κακοσχολίαι μηθὲν μήτε δι' ἐμαυτοῦ μήτε δι' ἑτέρου, μηδὲ πεπορίσθαι μηδὲ ἐνηνεχέναι γράμματα εἵνεκεν τοῦ λαβεῖν ἐρειθευτοὺς ⟨τοὺς⟩ δικαστὰς ἢ κατ' ὄνομά τινας, μηδὲ παρακεκληκέναι εἰς ταῦτα μηθ[ὲ]ν, μηδὲ ἐφθαρκέναι τοὺς
δικαστὰς μηδὲ φθερεῖν τρόπωι μηθενὶ μηδὲ παρευρέσει μηδεμιᾶι· εὐορκοῦντι μέμ μοι εἴη πολλὰ καὶ ἀγαθά· εἰ δ' ἐφιορκοίην, ἐξώλης εἴην καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ τἀμὰ πάντα. μετὰ δὲ τοὺς δικασταγωγοὺς ὀμοσάτωσαν καὶ οἱ δικασταὶ ἐπὶ τῶν αὐτῶν ἱερῶν τὸν ὑπογεγραμμένον ὅρκον. ὅρκος· ὀμμνύω Δία Ὀλύμ-

πιον, Ἥραν, Ποσειδῶ, Ἄρη, Ἀθηνᾶν, Δήμητρα, Ἀπόλλω καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους
θεοὺς πάντας καὶ πάσας ὡς μὴν κρινεῖν τὰ ἀντιλεγόμενα ἐν τοῖς εἰσφερομέ-
νοις ὁμο[λόγο]ις ὑπὸ Βου[με]λιταιέων καὶ Ἀλέων ὡς ἄμ μοι φαίνηται βέλτιστα
. . . . . I . . ıı . . ΟΙ[. . . . κ]αὶ τοὺς ὅρους ἐπελθὼν ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν
[κ]ρεινεῖν
. . . 25 . . . κατὰ τὴν εὐθεῖαν ὀρθῶς καὶ δικαίως ὑπάρχει ΟΙΟ
[. . . 25 . . . ἐ]νθήσειν κατὰ τὴν εὐθεῖαν τοὺς ὅρους ἀκολού-
[θως τῶι κρίματι] . . 12 . . ΓΟΜ . . 8 . . ν ὅπηι ἄμ μοι φαίνηται ὑπάρχειν
. . . . . 36 . . . . . παρὰ τὸ κάθηκον οὐδετέροις ΟΥΛΗΙ
[. . . . . 35 . . . . . πα]ρ' ἐμοῦ οὐδὲν ἔτευχον

47: perhaps ἐτεύχθη instead of ἔτευχον: Bourguet.

A/B Column 2

Τ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Ο- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
ΣΙ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
ΣΑ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
ΜΕΝΙ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
ΓΑΝ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
ΦΟΙΣ - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
ΛΟΝΕ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
ΣΑΓ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
ΔΡΕ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
ΣΙΝΣ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
ΒΛΗΘ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
ΡΕΣΕΛΘ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
ΔΕΤΗΝ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
ΜΕΡΑΙΣΤ- - - - - - - - - - - - - -
ΤΗΙΚΡΙΝΟ- - - - - - - - - - - - - -
ΓΜΕΝΑΕ- - - - - - - - - - - - - -
ΕΜΜΕΙΝΑ- - - - - - - - - - - - - -
νασι κα[ί? - - - - - - -.] ὑπόδικοι [Β]
ὑπάρχο[ντες - - - - - -] πόλις συνειρε-
θῆι Ἐρετ[- - - - - δικας]ταγωγῶν, μηνὸς
Πανάμο[υ - - - - - - - -]όντων· παραγε-
νόμενοι [δὲ οἱ δικασταὶ - - -]τες γενομένης
τῆς τε ε- - - - - - - - - - - -ι ἑκατέρων, ἐφ' οὓς
ὑπῆρχο[ν - - - - - - - - -]θέντων τῶν λό-
γων ὑφη- - - - - - - - - - - - . c διότι οὐκ εἴη-
σαν ου- - - - - - - - - - - -ειαν καθὼς τὸ ˅
κρῖμα τ[ὸ - - - - - - - - - - -]ωμεν ˅ αὐτοὶ ἐ-
πελθόν[τες ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν?. . c. 12 . .κα]τὰ τὴν ὁμολο-
γίαν κ- - - - - - - - - - - -νοιτο εὐθυγνώ-
μηι τῆ[ι - - - - - - - - - - -]νοι τῶι βωμῶι
τοῦ Δ[ιὸς τοῦ Ἀκροκαλλιστίου . . c. 10 . .] γενέσθαι τὴν

εὐῳ- - - - - - - - - - - - - ἱερὸν τὸ ἐπὶ θα-
[λάσσηι - - - - - - - - - - - - -] ἱεροῦ ἀρξάμε-
[νοι - - - - - - - - - - - - - λα]μβάνοντες
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -οροc εἰc ευ.

17–18: [ἐν Δελ]|φοῖc: Bourguet. || 25–26: [ἐν ἡ]|μέραις τ[ριcὶ or τριcὶ καὶ δέκα]: Bourguet. || 27: τῆι κρινο[μένηι]: Bourguet. || 27–28: [τὰ δεδογ]|μένα ἑ[κατέροις]: Bourguet. || 28–30: Robert (*BCH* 53) suggests the following as a possible restoration: [τὰ δεδογ]μένα ε[ἶναι κύρια καὶ βέβαια – ἀποτεῖcαι δὲ τοὺc μὴ] |ἐμμείνα[ντας τῶι κρίματι τάλαντα – τοῖc ἐμμεί]|ναcι. || 29: ἐμμεῖνα[ι τῶι κρίματι]: Bourguet. || 29–30: [τοῖc ἐμμεί]|ναcι κα[ὶ]: Bourguet. || 36–37: [κατὰ τὴν Ἐρετρι?]|έων ὑφή[γηcιν]: Bourguet. [λό]|γων: Michaud. || 37–38: διότι οὐκ εἴα|caν οὐ[δενί]: Bousquet. || 39–40: [ἐ]|πελθό[ντες ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν or τοὺc ὅρουc]: Bourguet. || 44: εὐῳ[νυμα]: Bourguet. εὐθ[εῖαν]: Bousquet. || 46: [χαρά]δραν ὄντεc: Michaud.

A Column 3

- - - - - - - - - - -οτου- - - - - -οδον- - -
[- - - - - - - - - θάλ]ατταν - - - - -ε . . υ- - - -
- - - - - - - - - - -υ διαβάν[των] - - - -λλοc . . ΟΕ - -
[- - - - - - - - - Ἀμ]πιχείας [νάπηc - - - -] ἀπὸ τοῦ ου - -
- - - - - - - - - -ντων το - - - - - ⟨π⟩λαγίωι ἀπὸ τοῦ
- - - - - - - - - -τηι λει[- - - - - - Ἀμ]πιχείας νάπηc
- - - - - - - - - -ην αια - - - - -οc ἐν τῶι Λαπαρῶι
- - - - - - - - - -δον απ - - - -τον πρὸc τῆι Λοκρί-
[δι - - - - - - - - -]ου τῆc α[- - - - τ]ῶν ορων ἀνα[βα]ινόν-
[των . . . 19 . . .εὐ]θὺ τοῦ - - - -ΕΡΗ Ἀλέων. τὰ δὲ εὐῳ-
[νυμα Βουμελιταιέων - - -] κρίcιc· [τοὶ δικαcταὶ ἀποcταλέντε]c ὑπὸ τᾶc πόλιοc τῶν
[Θηβαίων – ἔκριναν –]Βουμελιτα[ιεῦcι καὶ Ἀλεῦcι - - περὶ] τᾶc χώραc τᾶc ἀντιλε-
[γομένας - - - γρα]πτὸν δ ἐθ[έθη - - - - - - - -]ν ὅρια τᾶc χώραc Βου-
[μελιταιέων - - -]c caμείωι ⟨ὑ⟩[πὲρ τὸν βωμὸν τοῦ Διὸc τ]οῦ Ἀκροκαλλιcτί[ο]υ
[- - - - - κὰτ τ]ὰν [ε]ὐθεῖαν ἄ[χρι πὸτ τὸ - - -]τὸ ἐπὶ θαλαccίνηι ο
[- - - τᾶc γενομέν]ac εὐθεία[c - - - - - τὰν] γενομέναν εὐθεῖαν
- - - - - - -c ἄχρι [π]ὸτ[- - - - - - - - ἀν]αβαινόντων ἀπὸ τοῦ
[τ]ᾶc ⟨Ἡ⟩ρα[c ἱαροῦ?] . 6 . ΙΔ . 8 . Τ- - - -ων ἄχρι πὸτ τὰν Λοκρί-
δα Ἀλέων· τὰ [δὲ ἄχρι πὸτ τὰν] . . 10 . . Ι[- - cύμφωνοι] ἐγένοντο ἑκάτε-
ροι ἐν τᾶι περ[όδωι - - - - ἐ]φ[ηγηcάμενοι - ἐπὶ τοὺc ὅρο]υc ἀπὸ τοῦ βωμοῦ τοῦ
Διὸc τοῦ Ἀκρο[καλλιcτίου - - -]τα- - - - - -ω καθὼc γέγραπται
cυνελθόντεc π. . 14 . . [ἐν] ἀμέρα[ιc τριcὶ καὶ δέκα . . . . ἃ κρίcι]c γεγένηται.

9: perhaps ὅρων or perhaps [εἰc τὴν κορυφὴν τ]ῶν ὀρῶν ἀναβαινόν[των]: Bourguet. || 11–13: Robert (*BCH* 53) suggests the following restoration: [τάδε ἔκριναν τοὶ ἀποcταλέντε]c ὑπὸ τᾶc πόλιοc τῶν| [Θηβαίων δικαcταὶ] Βουμελιτα[ιεῦcι

καὶ Ἁλεῦσι περὶ] τᾶς χώρας τᾶς ἀντιλε|[γομένας κατὰ τὸ γρα]πτὸν δ ἔθ[εντο κοινᾶι ταὶ πόλεις εἶμε]ν ὅρια τᾶς χώρας κτλ. || 13: perhaps [γρα]πτὸν δ ἔθε[ντο ταὶ πόλεις]: Bourguet. || 15: ἐπὶ θαλασσίνηι ὁδ[ῶι]: Bourguet (hesitantly), Pouilloux.

This lengthy but fragmented inscription deals with a boundary arbitration between two small Boiotian cities, close to the Lokrian border. The two litigants were Halai and Boumelita, and the judges almost certainly came from Thebes.[1] This document is one of the most detailed of inscriptions dealing with arbitration. It is significant for the information it provides concerning the procedures involved in submitting a dispute to arbitration, and in particular for the light shed on the responsibilities of the various officials.

From the fragmented lines at the beginning of the first column we learn that there had been a previous judgement given in this case, a judgement that apparently was not satisfactory.[2] The two cities did not, however, lose their faith in the arbitral process; instead, they agreed to appeal again to a third city: Thebes, whose name no doubt appeared at the end of line 5. The present document is the *compromissum*, the ad hoc voluntary agreement between states to submit a particular problem to the judgement of a third party agreeable to both. The judgement was to be achieved by the visit of the Theban judges and their secretary to the disputed territory (the ἐφήγησις) in order to survey the boundary markers that had been set up in the past by both sides. That the process of inviting the arbitration of a third state was a diplomatic one is emphasized by the dispatch of ambassadors from the two litigant states to request the services of Thebes (line 9). Both of the disputing states were also to send certain officials called δικασταγωγοί to the arbitrating state. These officials were to be in charge of escorting the dikasts. In any arbitration where we find δικασταγωγοί, such men were responsible for seeing to the comfort of the judges, but they no doubt acted as watchdogs of a sort as well.[3] The oath of the δικασταγωγοί in this inscription tells us that they were to keep an eye not only on the comfort of the Theban judges but also on their integrity. And these officials, since they were sent as representatives by both the disputant states, will also have acted as checks on each other.

The dikasts from Thebes were to receive a written register of the boundary points from each of Halai and Boumelita. Written affidavits, as well as documentary evidence, are referred to also in other cases of arbitration and

1. This document was inscribed on the Treasury of Thebes at Delphi. Cf. **126**. The date of this arbitration remains uncertain, though perhaps a date after 167 and the dissolution of the Boiotian *koinon* (which does not appear here) is most appropriate; see Daverio Rocchi; P. Roesch, *Études béotiennes* (Paris, 1982) p. 400.

2. Line 4: [κα]τὰ τὴν κρίσιν τὴν γενο[μένην]; line 5: οὐκ ἐγενήθησαν σύμφω[ν]οι. The problem may have been restricted to certain details; cf. **38**.

3. Cf. **63** and **9** Appendix, **12** Appendix, and **13** Appendix.

presumably formed a valuable addition to formal proceedings.[4] This register would aid the judges in studying the case beforehand and might help to eliminate spontaneous claims from one side or the other during the physical examination of the ground. The dikasts were to visit each city in turn; representatives from both Halai and Boumelita were assured the opportunity to escort them over the disputed land itself, and at the same time no doubt to argue their case. There must have been two separate examinations of the territory, one in the company of advocates from Halai, one with those from Boumelita (lines 13–17).[5] Each city was to send ten men as its advocates, choosing them from the city's συνέδριον. These provisions both ensured a degree of expertise among the advocates and satisfied the demands for fairness to both sides. Further provisions for objectivity lay in the regulation that the judges were to choose by lot the city that was to be first to escort them over the land and argue their case. We can determine from this case that the inspection of the disputed territory, so central to any border dispute, was hedged around with careful rules of procedure.

Before any of this was to take place, however, the judges, the δικασταγωγοί, and those who were to show the judges about the disputed land and argue the case for their own city, in other words, the advocates, all had to swear an oath. Oaths were of vital importance in any legal proceeding, of course, and no less so in a case of arbitration.[6] The advocates' oath comes first (lines 18–24), and it reflects the pattern of safeguards, checks, and balances evident in arbitration agreements in general. The oath, sworn by Olympian Zeus, Hera, Poseidon, Ares, Athena, Demeter, Apollo, and "all the other gods and goddesses," prohibits the advocates strictly from interfering with the boundary markers of the disputed land in any way during their tour with the judges. Typical of such oaths, it invokes disaster if it is broken. The advocates, then, were to swear that they would behave in an upright fashion when they took the judges around the disputed land. The δικασταγωγοί were also to take an oath before this tour could take place, but their oath (lines 26–37) refers to the past rather than the future. They must swear, by the same roster of gods, that they did not discuss the land or any of the matters in dispute with the dikasts or their scribe or their servants, nor did they try to bribe or corrupt them in any way while they were escorting them from Thebes. In so doing, they attested to their status as neutral officials safeguarding the general arbitral procedure, rather than advocates. They were asked to swear that they in no way influenced or allowed others to influence the judges while the latter were in their charge. Hence, the oath of the δικασταγωγοί is actually more concerned with the potential behaviour of the dikasts than with

4. See **21**, with the extensive rulings about what written materials were acceptable, and how they had to be dealt with. Cf. also **26**.

5. Cf. **30**, **63**, **118**.

6. Cf. **21** and **71**.

that of their keepers. Guarding against corruption of the judges was one of the regular duties of a δικαστα γωγός.[7] The final oath, which is largely lost, is that of the dikasts themselves, in which they swear to judge righteously and honestly, examining the land in person, and establishing the boundary in a straight line. This oath may have carried over to the top of the second column, which is also lost.

The subject of the few fragments of the second column that survive is largely obscure. There may have been provision for publication at Delphi (lines 17–18), sanctions to be applied in the case of one side refusing to abide by the judgement (lines 28–30), and a time limit (thirteen days?) set for the examination of the land (lines 25–26). Arbitration agreements typically included such requirements as the promise of publication, often in an international centre of importance, and the declaration of potential sanctions against the side that refuses to recognize the validity. These lines are terribly fragmented, however, and do not provide any independent evidence on these matters. There may also be a reference to the previous judgement (of the Eretrians? line 39) and the reason for its failure. After this the document would have moved on to discuss the tour carried out by the new arbitral board of the Thebans (lines 40f.) and then would have begun the actual boundary demarcation, which is continued in column 3. Column 3, the publication of the findings of the judges from Thebes, is also in an incomplete state, but what we have of it is quite typical of other boundary delineations. On the whole, the delineation appears to run from the heights to the ocean, with the precinct of Zeus Akrokallistios as a starting point.[8] Perhaps the first part of column 3, and the last part of column 2, described the tour of the judges and the areas and boundary points to be judged (numerous proper names appear), while lines 11f. of column 3 represent the final decision.

This case of arbitration is particularly interesting in that it demonstrates that the degree of formality in arbitral procedure was not necessarily linked to the size or relative significance of the disputants. The decision to inscribe not only the final findings of the Theban tribunal but also the initial agreement to seek arbitration, the rules to be followed, and the oaths to be sworn means that we have here one of the most detailed examples of certain aspects of that procedure. That virtually every point in the process given in this inscription can be documented in some other case of arbitration as well is evidence that there was an accepted international set of guidelines, even if there were neither permanent international tribunals nor a codified set of international laws.

7. Tod, pp. 83f.
8. Pouilloux, p. 14.

130. The Lycian *koinon* arbitrates a boundary dispute between Araxa and a neighbour (after 167 or later?)

A limestone block discovered at Ören Köyü in Turkey. H: 0.91 m; w: 0.36 m; d: 0.07 m. Only the relevant portions of the inscription are cited here.

G. E. Bean, *JHS* 68 (1948) pp. 46f., no. 11; L. Moretti, *RFC* n.s. 28 (1950) pp. 326–50; *J. Pouilloux, *Choix d' inscriptions grecques* (Paris, 1960) 4; *SEG* XVIII.570.

Robert, *REG* 1950, 183; J. A. O. Larsen, *CPh* 51 (1956) pp. 151–69; Larsen, *GFS*, pp. 241f.; Will, vol. 2, p. 229; Sherwin-White, pp. 49f.; R. M. Errington, *Chiron* 17 (1987) pp. 114–18; *SEG* XXXVII.1218.

Ἐπὶ ἱερέων Ὀρθαγόρου καὶ Μηνοκρίτου, μ(ηνὸς)
Δύστρου δευτέραι, ἐκλησίας ἐννόμου ο[ὔ]-
σης, ἔδοξεν Ἀραξέων τῶι δήμωι καὶ τοῖς ἄρ-
χουσιν· ἐπεὶ Ὀρθαγόρας Δημητρίου ὁ πολίτης ἡ-
μῶν, ἀνὴρ καλὸς καὶ ἀγαθὸς ὑπάρχων διὰ προγό-
νων, πολλὰς καὶ μεγάλας ἀποδείξεις πεποίη-
ται τῆς πρὸς τὸν δῆμον εὐνοίας ἐκ τῆς πρ[ώ]-
της ἡλικίας·....

.... ἐνστάντος τε ἡμεῖν ἀγῶνος
περὶ τῆς ἐν Σοάσοις χώρας πρὸς τοὺς ἀμφισβητοῦντας ὑ-
πὲρ αὐτῆς, ἀποσταλεὶς πρεσβευτὴς πρὸς τὸ κοιν(ὸν) ἀγαθὸς
ἀγωνιστὴς ἐγένετο καὶ λόγῳ καὶ ἔργῳ εἰς τὸ πάντα τὰ
συμφέροντα τῷ δήμῳ ἡμῶν περιγενέσθαι καὶ ἐν μηδεν[ὶ]
ἐλαττωθῆναι....

This inscription is a decree of the people of Araxa in Lycia, honouring the Araxian citizen Orthagoras, son of Demetrios, for his services to his city. Among the various services that Orthagoras offered his city in times of unrest was that of advocate in a federal arbitration. Araxa had a territorial dispute with a neighbour over a piece of land in "Soasa."[1] Orthagoras was detailed by the Araxians to act as their ambassador and advocate in the lawsuit. The case was arbitrated by the Lycian *koinon* itself, as may have been customary in some federal leagues when disputes arose between members.[2] Orthagoras evidently won the case for the Araxians.

1. Unknown; see Bean, p. 50. The neighbouring state, with whom Araxa had the dispute, must have been either Tlos or Kadyanda (Robert, p. 191).

2. Cf. the Boiotians (**16**, **17**). Larsen (*CPh* 51, p. 161) suggests the institution involved may have been the federal court mentioned by Strabo (C 665).

The date of this arbitration is subject to controversy. It is generally recognized that Orthagoras's activities may be dated by relating them to the appearance of a Roman connection in the inscription. Orthagoras was also instrumental in establishing a cult of Roma (lines 69f.). This has been interpreted as an attempt by Lycia to curry favour with Rome, an attempt that has been dated to the period shortly after 189/8, and Lycia's attempts to gain Roman support against Rhodes.[3] But more recent studies favour a later date. It has been argued that the appearance of the Romans "Publius" and "Appius" in this inscription should be connected to the sojourn in Asia of Publius Lentulus and Appius Claudius, sent out to deal with the wars of Pergamon and Bithynia between 156 and 154.[4] The absence of any mention of Rhodes is also significant, suggesting a date after 167 at least.

131. Rome asks Korkyra to arbitrate between Ambrakia and Athamania (c. 166?)

Two inscriptions, discovered separately at Korkyra, but apparently related.

I: A letter of a Roman magistrate and a *senatus consultum*. H: 0.44 m; w (max.): 0.26 m.

*M. Holleaux, *BCH* 48 (1924) pp. 381–98 (= *Études*, vol. 5, pp. 433–47); L. Robert, *SEG* III.451; Sherk 4; Moretti, *ISE* 91.

II: A Korkyrean decree. H: 0.35 m; w: 0.16 m.

C. Wachsmuth, *RhM* 18 (1863) p. 539, no. 2; A. Mustoxydis, *Della cose Corciresi* (Corfu, 1848) p. 207, no. 12; Blass, *SGDI* 3204; *Dittenberger, *IG* IX.1.690.

Raeder 53; Tod 81; W. Dörpfeld, *AA* 1914, p. 50; L. R. Taylor, *The Voting Districts of the Roman Republic* (Rome, 1960) p. 168; E. S. Gruen, *JHS* 96 (1976) p. 50; C. Habicht, *Demetrias* I (Bonn, 1976) p. 178; Will, vol. 2, p. 263; Gruen, p. 108; P. Cabanes/J. Andréou, *BCH* 109 (1985) pp. 540f.

I: The Roman letter and *senatus consultum*

Πόπλιος Κορ[νή]λιος Π[ο]-
πλίου υἱὸς Βλασίων
στρατηγὸς χαίρειν

3. Larsen, *GFS*, p. 245; A. H. M. Jones (*ap.* Bean, p. 53).

4. See Sherwin-White, Bean, and Errington. "Publius" could also be P. Scipio Aemilianus, on the Eastern embassy traditionally dated to 140/39 (Sherwin-White), and to 144/3 by H. B. Mattingly (*CQ* 36 [1986] pp. 491–95); cf. **155**.

The date of this arbitration is subject to controversy. It is generally recognized that Orthagoras's activities may be dated by relating them to the appearance of a Roman connection in the inscription. Orthagoras was also instrumental in establishing a cult of Roma (lines 69f.). This has been interpreted as an attempt by Lycia to curry favour with Rome, an attempt that has been dated to the period shortly after 189/8, and Lycia's attempts to gain Roman support against Rhodes.[3] But more recent studies favour a later date. It has been argued that the appearance of the Romans "Publius" and "Appius" in this inscription should be connected to the sojourn in Asia of Publius Lentulus and Appius Claudius, sent out to deal with the wars of Pergamon and Bithynia between 156 and 154.[4] The absence of any mention of Rhodes is also significant, suggesting a date after 167 at least.

131. Rome asks Korkyra to arbitrate between Ambrakia and Athamania (c. 166?)

Two inscriptions, discovered separately at Korkyra, but apparently related.

I: A letter of a Roman magistrate and a *senatus consultum*. H: 0.44 m; w (max.): 0.26 m.

*M. Holleaux, *BCH* 48 (1924) pp. 381–98 (= *Études*, vol. 5, pp. 433–47); L. Robert, *SEG* III.451; Sherk 4; Moretti, *ISE* 91.

II: A Korkyrean decree. H: 0.35 m; w: 0.16 m.

C. Wachsmuth, *RhM* 18 (1863) p. 539, no. 2; A. Mustoxydis, *Della cose Corciresi* (Corfu, 1848) p. 207, no. 12; Blass, *SGDI* 3204; *Dittenberger, *IG* IX.1.690.

Raeder 53; Tod 81; W. Dörpfeld, *AA* 1914, p. 50; L. R. Taylor, *The Voting Districts of the Roman Republic* (Rome, 1960) p. 168; E. S. Gruen, *JHS* 96 (1976) p. 50; C. Habicht, *Demetrias* I (Bonn, 1976) p. 178; Will, vol. 2, p. 263; Gruen, p. 108; P. Cabanes/J. Andréou, *BCH* 109 (1985) pp. 540f.

I: The Roman letter and *senatus consultum*

Πόπλιος Κορ[νή]λιος Π[ο]-
πλίου υἱὸς Βλασίων
στρατηγὸς χαίρειν

3. Larsen, *GFS*, p. 245; A. H. M. Jones (*ap.* Bean, p. 53).

4. See Sherwin-White, Bean, and Errington. "Publius" could also be P. Scipio Aemilianus, on the Eastern embassy traditionally dated to 140/39 (Sherwin-White), and to 144/3 by H. B. Mattingly (*CQ* 36 [1986] pp. 491–95); cf. **155**.

λέγει ἄρχουσι δήμωι
τε Κορκυραίων· πρεσβευ-
ταὶ Ἀμβρακιῶται καὶ
Ἀθαμᾶνες ἐμοὶ προσ-
ήλθοσαν ἵν' αὐτοῖς σύγ-
κλητον δῶ. ἐγὼ αὐτοῖς
σύγκλητον ἔδωκα.
συγκλήτου δόγμα τόδε ἐστίν. πρὸ ἡμερῶν
τριῶν νωνῶν Κοιγκτιλίων ἐγ κομετίωι· γραφομένου παρῆσαν
Γνάιος Ἐγνά{c}τιος Γαίου υἱὸς C⟨τ⟩ηλατίνας, Τίτος Ὠφίδιος Μάρκου υἱὸς Ποπιλίας, Γάιος Σεμβρώνιος Λευκίου υἱ[ός]
- - - - - - - - - - - - -

II: The decree of Korkyra

[- - - - - - Ἀ]θαμάνων περὶ . . . . . .
. . . . . καταβάντων τᾶι περι . . . 10 . . .
. . . . . εἰς ὁμόλογον καὶ ἀπὸ τᾶς . . 8 . .
. . . . . ἔφαν ὁρίζειν τὰς κώμας . . . 10 . . .
[. . . . . περι]βολὰ λίθων καὶ ἱερὸν Ποσειδᾶ[νος . .8 . .]
. . 8 . . το ὅτι Ποσειδᾶνός ἐστι πριζ . . . . .
[. . . . ἀν]ὰ τὸν βουνὸν ἄνω καθὼς . . 8 . .
. . . . . καθ' ἄκρον ἐπὶ τὸν με . . . . . .
. . . . . τέρμονα εἶμεν . . . .

4: ἐφ' ἂν: Mustoxydis, Blass. || 6: πρίζ[ειν]: Mustoxydis.

These fragmented inscriptions shed some light on the mechanism of Rome's referral of a request for arbitration to a neutral third party in Greece.[1] The first document is a letter from Publius Cornelius Blasio, the Roman praetor, to the city of Korkyra.[2] This letter informs the people of Korkyra that Blasio had received delegations from the neighbouring peoples of Ambrakia and Athamania. The Ambrakians and Athamanians apparently had a border dispute that they had agreed to refer to Rome. The embassies sent by the two states requested a senatorial hearing from the praetor, which was granted. The senate thereupon handed down a decision on the matter, which was included in the original letter, but which is now lost. Judging from the fact that the letter to the Korkyraians was

1. Cf. **120**, **159**, **164**.
2. Broughton, vol. 1, p. 438, suggests a date for Blasio's praetorship of very soon after 166.

from Blasio, it is probable that the senate asked the praetor to take charge of the affair and find a suitable arbitrator to judge between Athamania and Ambrakia, as Aemilius was charged with finding an arbitrator between Magnesia and Priene (**120**). The letter and *senatus consultum* were inscribed on the same stone as a fragmented, and apparently still unpublished, inscription that recorded the findings of the Korkyraian tribunal that judged the dispute between Athamania and Ambrakia. The fragment cited here as document II is probably part of this judgement.[3]

This dispute between Ambrakia and Athamania should probably be connected to other disputes involving Ambrakia in this period. Five Athenian judges were sent out in 166 to resolve a quarrel between Ambrakia and Akarnania (**132**). The evidence for the other dispute consists of a boundary delineation between Ambrakia and Charadros (**18** Appendix).[4] In the latter case Ambrakia and its neighbour apparently were able to work out their differences to their mutual satisfaction, without the help of an arbitrator. But the sufferings of western Greece in the wake of the Third Macedonian War probably encouraged Ambrakia to turn to outside help to regulate its affairs.

132. Athens arbitrates between Akarnania and Ambrakia (?) (166)

Three fragments of an inscription discovered on the acropolis at Athens.

Köhler, *IG* II.356; Kirchner, *IG* II^2 951; *Wilhelm, *Neue Beiträge* 1, pp. 23f. (reproduced in *IG* II^2 *add.* p. 669).

Holleaux, *Études*, vol. 5, p. 445; C. Habicht, *Demetrias* I (Bonn, 1976) p. 177; P. Cabanes/J. Andreou, *BCH* 109 (1985) pp. 539–40; C. Habicht, *ZPE* 62 (1986) pp. 190f.

Ἐπὶ Νικοσθένου ἄρχον[τος μηνὸς Θαργηλιῶνος]
πέμπτει ἀπιόντος ὡ[ς Ἀθηναῖοι, ὡς δὲ Ἀμ]-

3. Holleaux, *Études*, vol. 5, p. 438, cites conjectural restorations of one or two of the twenty-four lines of the unpublished inscription. [Κρί]μα τὸ γ[ενόμενον περὶ χώρας Ἀθαμᾶσι καὶ Ἀμβρακιώταις?] is suggested as the possible restoration of the heading of the inscribed judgement. Holleaux also cites line 13: ἃ κρίσις ὑμῖν τελεσθησεῖται ἐν Κ[ορκύραι]. The Ambrakians are mentioned by name at line 17 of the unpublished inscription, and the Athamanians of course appear in that fragment published at *IG* IX.1.690 (II above).

4. There is virtually nothing in the inscription recording the boundary settlement between Ambrakia and Charadros to confirm the arbitration of a third party. But the words ἀρχὰς ῥωμαϊκάς may suggest Roman involvement at some level, although the inscription at this point (I, line 38) is far too fragmented to afford a context for the reference to Rome.

from Blasio, it is probable that the senate asked the praetor to take charge of the affair and find a suitable arbitrator to judge between Athamania and Ambrakia, as Aemilius was charged with finding an arbitrator between Magnesia and Priene (**120**). The letter and *senatus consultum* were inscribed on the same stone as a fragmented, and apparently still unpublished, inscription that recorded the findings of the Korkyraian tribunal that judged the dispute between Athamania and Ambrakia. The fragment cited here as document II is probably part of this judgement.[3]

This dispute between Ambrakia and Athamania should probably be connected to other disputes involving Ambrakia in this period. Five Athenian judges were sent out in 166 to resolve a quarrel between Ambrakia and Akarnania (**132**). The evidence for the other dispute consists of a boundary delineation between Ambrakia and Charadros (**18** Appendix).[4] In the latter case Ambrakia and its neighbour apparently were able to work out their differences to their mutual satisfaction, without the help of an arbitrator. But the sufferings of western Greece in the wake of the Third Macedonian War probably encouraged Ambrakia to turn to outside help to regulate its affairs.

132. Athens arbitrates between Akarnania and Ambrakia (?) (166)

Three fragments of an inscription discovered on the acropolis at Athens.

Köhler, *IG* II.356; Kirchner, *IG* II^2 951; *Wilhelm, *Neue Beiträge* 1, pp. 23f. (reproduced in *IG* II^2 *add.* p. 669).

Holleaux, *Études*, vol. 5, p. 445; C. Habicht, *Demetrias* I (Bonn, 1976) p. 177; P. Cabanes/J. Andreou, *BCH* 109 (1985) pp. 539–40; C. Habicht, *ZPE* 62 (1986) pp. 190f.

Ἐπὶ Νικοσθένου ἄρχον[τος μηνὸς Θαργηλιῶνος]
πέμπτει ἀπιόντος ὡ[ς Ἀθηναῖοι, ὡς δὲ Ἀμ]-

3. Holleaux, *Études*, vol. 5, p. 438, cites conjectural restorations of one or two of the twenty-four lines of the unpublished inscription. [Κρί]μα τὸ γ[ενόμενον περὶ χώρας Ἀθαμᾶσι καὶ Ἀμβρακιώταις?] is suggested as the possible restoration of the heading of the inscribed judgement. Holleaux also cites line 13: ἃ κρίσις ὑμῖν τελεσθησεῖται ἐν Κ[ορκύραι]. The Ambrakians are mentioned by name at line 17 of the unpublished inscription, and the Athamanians of course appear in that fragment published at *IG* IX.1.690 (II above).

4. There is virtually nothing in the inscription recording the boundary settlement between Ambrakia and Charadros to confirm the arbitration of a third party. But the words ἀρχὰς ῥωμαϊκάς may suggest Roman involvement at some level, although the inscription at this point (I, line 38) is far too fragmented to afford a context for the reference to Rome.

βρακιῶται ἐπὶ γραμ[ματέως . . . . . μ]ηνὸς [Φοι]-
νικαίου πέμπτει ἀ[πιόντος, ὡς δὲ Ἀκα]ρνᾶνε[ς]
ἐπὶ στρατηγοῦ Χρεμᾶ [μηνὸς Ἐσπερι]νοῦ? τετρά[δι]
ἀπιόντος, ὅρκος [δικαστῶν χειρο]τονηθέντω[ν]
[ὑπὸ τ]οῦ [δήμου ἐπὶ δίκας Ἀμβρ]ακιώταις καὶ Ἀκαρ-
[νᾶσι - - - - - - - - - - Καλ]λιστράτου Ἐροιά-
[δου, - - - - - - - - - - -, Κηφισο]δότου Συβρίδου,
[. . . . . Π]αλληνέως· ὀμνύω τ[ὸν] Δία τὸν [Σωτῆρα]
[καὶ τὴν Ἥρ]αν καὶ τὸν Ποσειδῶ κα[ὶ τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν κτλ.]

1: [μηνὸς Ποσιδεῶνος]: Kirchner. || 2–3: ὧ[μοσαν τὸν νόμιμον ὅρκον Ἀμ]|βρα-
[κ]ιῶται: Kirchner. || 5: [Χ]ρεμά[του]: Kirchner. || 6: ὅπως ἄ[ν . . . . . .
χειρο]τονηθέντα: Kirchner. || 10–11: [τὸν Δ]ία τὸν [βασιλέ]|α: Kirchner.

The restoration of this inscription by Wilhelm suggests that it is evidence for an arbitration performed by the Athenians for the Ambrakians and Akarnanians. The oath would be the oath sworn by the Athenian judges elected by the people, probably containing clauses intended to guarantee impartial judgement and incorruptibility.[1] Wilhelm argued that this arbitration, if it is such, should be dated to 164/3. Dinsmoor, however, showed that the archon Nikosthenes should be assigned to the year 167/6.[2] An Athenian arbitration carried out for the Ambrakians at this time could be connected to other Ambrakian settlements of the period.[3] Perhaps this was a time, after the Third Macedonian War, when Ambrakia was seeking to redraw its boundaries in all directions. Still, there is no way of knowing the exact subject of the dispute that the five Athenian judges were to settle between Ambrakia and Akarnania. If Wilhelm's restoration ἐπὶ δίκας (line 7) is correct, then it may not have been a matter of a boundary arbitration. The plural term would indicate that the Athenians were to settle unresolved disputes between the Ambrakians and Akarnanians, perhaps suits of a private rather than a public nature. The Athenian judges may have been invited in accordance with a *symbolon* between Ambrakia and Akarnania.

133. Skarphai and Thronion dispute the hieromnemonic vote (c. 165–160 and later?)

A series of documents from the monument of Aemilius Paullus at Delphi that deal with relations between Thronion and Skarphai in the latter half of the second century. This material is treated in full in **167** (q.v. for editions and

1. Cf. **21**, **71**, **129**.

2. W. B. Dinsmoor, *The Athenian Archon List* (New York, 1939) p. 189. Habicht places this arbitration sometime around June 166.

3. See **131**, **18** Appendix.

βρακιῶται ἐπὶ γραμ[ματέως . . . . . μ]ηνὸς [Φοι]-
νικαίου πέμπτει ἀ[πιόντος, ὡς δὲ Ἀκα]ρνᾶνε[ς]
ἐπὶ στρατηγοῦ Χρεμᾶ [μηνὸς Ἐσπερι]νοῦ? τετρά[δι]
ἀπιόντος, ὅρκος [δικαστῶν χειρο]τονηθέντω[ν]
[ὑπὸ τ]οῦ [δήμου ἐπὶ δίκας Ἀμβρ]ακιώταις καὶ Ἀκαρ-
[νᾶσι - - - - - - - - - - Καλ]λιστράτου Ἐροιά-
[δου, - - - - - - - - - - -, Κηφισο]δότου Συβρίδου,
[. . . . . Π]αλληνέως· ὀμνύω τ[ὸν] Δία τὸν [Σωτῆρα]
[καὶ τὴν Ἥρ]αν καὶ τὸν Ποσειδῶ κα[ὶ τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν κτλ.]

1: [μηνὸς Ποσιδεῶνος]: Kirchner. || 2–3: ὧ[μοσαν τὸν νόμιμον ὅρκον Ἀμ]|βρα-
[κ]ιῶται: Kirchner. || 5: [Χ]ρεμά[του]: Kirchner. || 6: ὅπως ἄ[ν . . . . . .
χειρο]τονηθέντα: Kirchner. || 10–11: [τὸν Δ]ία τὸν [βασιλέ]|α: Kirchner.

The restoration of this inscription by Wilhelm suggests that it is evidence for an arbitration performed by the Athenians for the Ambrakians and Akarnanians. The oath would be the oath sworn by the Athenian judges elected by the people, probably containing clauses intended to guarantee impartial judgement and incorruptibility.[1] Wilhelm argued that this arbitration, if it is such, should be dated to 164/3. Dinsmoor, however, showed that the archon Nikosthenes should be assigned to the year 167/6.[2] An Athenian arbitration carried out for the Ambrakians at this time could be connected to other Ambrakian settlements of the period.[3] Perhaps this was a time, after the Third Macedonian War, when Ambrakia was seeking to redraw its boundaries in all directions. Still, there is no way of knowing the exact subject of the dispute that the five Athenian judges were to settle between Ambrakia and Akarnania. If Wilhelm's restoration ἐπὶ δίκας (line 7) is correct, then it may not have been a matter of a boundary arbitration. The plural term would indicate that the Athenians were to settle unresolved disputes between the Ambrakians and Akarnanians, perhaps suits of a private rather than a public nature. The Athenian judges may have been invited in accordance with a *symbolon* between Ambrakia and Akarnania.

133. Skarphai and Thronion dispute the hieromnemonic vote (c. 165–160 and later?)

A series of documents from the monument of Aemilius Paullus at Delphi that deal with relations between Thronion and Skarphai in the latter half of the second century. This material is treated in full in **167** (q.v. for editions and

1. Cf. **21**, **71**, **129**.

2. W. B. Dinsmoor, *The Athenian Archon List* (New York, 1939) p. 189. Habicht places this arbitration sometime around June 166.

3. See **131**, **18** Appendix.

bibliography). The later material refers to earlier arbitration(s) that may have taken place in the 160s or later. The relevant passage is cited here (*FDelphes* III.4, 1.38.7–22).

ᵛ Ἀμφιλλέγει ἁ πόλις τῶν Θρονιέω[ν]
[περὶ τᾶς ἱε]ρομναμοσύνας ποτὶ τὰν πόλιν τῶν Σκαρφέων· "ἐπιβάλλει μοι τᾶς τῶ[ν]
['Επικν]αμι(δ)ίων Λοκρῶν ἀμφικτιονείας τὸ τρίτον μέρος, καθάπερ καὶ τὰ πρόβατα ἐ[ν]
[τὰς θυ]σίας καὶ τὰ ἄλλα τὰ νομιζόμενα πρότερον ἐν τοὺς Ἀμφικτίονας συ[μ]-
[βέβλ]ημαι, καὶ καθ' ὃ κέκριμαι πρότερον περὶ τούτων ἐν Ἀμφίσσαι κατὰ τὸ[ν]
[ἀμ]φικτιονικὸν νόμον· καὶ δεῖ κρατεῖν ἐμὲ καὶ κυριεύειν τοῦ ἐμῖν ἐπιβά[λ]-
[λ]οντος μέρεος, καὶ τὸν ἱερομνάμονα καθίστασθαι παρ' ἐμὲ καὶ πέμπεσθαι ὑπ' ἐμοῦ, ἐπεί κα ἐμὶν καθήκῃ ἁ ἱερομναμοσύνα. τὸ δέ, πόλι Σκαρφέων, ἀντιποιεῖσαι κακοπραγμόνως κατασοφιζομένα, καὶ ἐξιδιάζεσθα[ι θέ]-
λεις ἀδίκως τὸ ἐμὶν ἐπιβάλλον μέρος τᾶς ἱερομναμοσύνας." ᵛ ἁ πόλις τῶ[ν]
C[κ]αρφέων ἀντ[ε]γ[ρ]άψατο ποτὶ τὰν πόλιν τῶν Θρονιέω[ν]· "μὴ δεῖν εἶμεν τὸ τρί[τον]
μέρος τᾶς ἱερομναμοσύνας Θρονιέων, ἀλλ' εἶμεν κοινὰν τὰν ἱερομναμοσύν[αν]
Λοκρῶν τῶν ['Ε]πικναμιδίων κατά τε τὰ πάτρια καὶ τὰς γεγονείας περὶ το[ύ]-
των κρίσεις παρά τε τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις καὶ Ἀμφικτίοσιν, καὶ δεῖν τὸν ἱερομνά[μο]-
να καθίστασθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν Λοκρῶν ἀκολούθως τοῖς ἀπὸ τ[ᾶ]ς ἀρχ[ᾶς]
διωικημένοις καὶ τῶ[ι ὑ]πὸ 'Ρωμαίων κειμένωι γραπτῶι."

Late in the second century one or more arbitrations took place that settled two issues between the Epiknemidian Lokrian towns of Thronion and Skarphai (**167**). The first had to do with a bitter disagreement of long standing over the Epiknemidian Lokrian representation to the Amphiktyony, the ἱερομναμοσύνα, a privilege that both Thronion and Skarphai claimed.[1] The second dispute had to do with the borders between the two towns. We learn from the chief document dealing with the dispute over hieromnemonic representation that earlier arbitrations had taken place. Although it is impossible to date these earlier arbitrations with any certainty, it is not unlikely that one or more may be datable to the period after the Third Macedonian War.[2] Rivalry over ethnic representation to the Amphiktyony is documented elsewhere in the second century; the increased contention over Amphiktyonic rights appears to have had an inverse connection with the waning of real Amphiktyonic influence and authority.[3]

1. See Strabo 9.3.7 (C 420).

2. It seems appropriate to connect Athens and Rome working together on an arbitration with the period after the Third Macedonian War (cf. **126**). Certainly that would make the inscription of later documents dealing with the same dispute on the monument of Aemilius Paullus appropriate. See Pomtow, *Klio* 18 (1923) pp. 265–66; Daux, *Delphes,* p. 339.

3. Cf. **139**, **166**.

In fact, we hear of more than one early arbitration between Thronion and Skarphai. Late in the second century the Thronians appealed to the judgement of Amphissa, while the Skarphaians put forth that of Athens and the Amphiktyony itself.[4] It is interesting to note that Thronion claims the earlier judgement of Amphissa to have been made in accordance with Amphiktyonic law, while Skarphai, notwithstanding, also appeals to an Amphiktyonic judgement. In Skarphai's view, the earlier judgements of Athens and the Amphiktyony, which were in keeping with a Roman communication, ought to be upheld. It is likely that the Roman participation in the matter had to do with general rulings on the broader questions of the administration of the Delphic Amphiktyony, rather than the specific issues involving Thronion and Skarphai.[5]

134. The Roman senate mediates between Eumenes II and Prousias II (164–160)

I: Polybios 31.1.3–8.
II: Diodoros 31.7.2.
III: Polybios 31.32.1–2.
IV: Polybios 32.1.5–6.

McShane, pp. 185–86; Errington, *Dawn*, pp. 244f.; Hansen[2], pp. 124f.; Will, vol. 2, pp. 380ff.; Sherwin-White, pp. 37f.

I: Polybios 31.1.3–8

Συνέβαινε γὰρ τὸν Προυσίαν οὐ μόνον αὐτὸν ἐνεργῶς κεχρῆσθαι ταῖς διαβολαῖς ταῖς κατὰ τὸν Εὐμένη καὶ τὸν Ἀντίοχον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς Γαλάτας παρωξυκέναι καὶ τοὺς Σελγεῖς καὶ πλείους ἑτέρους κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν πρὸς τὴν αὐτὴν ὑπόθεσιν. (4) ὧν χάριν ὁ βασιλεὺς Εὐμένης ἐξαπεστάλκει τοὺς ἀδελφούς, ἀπολογησομένους πρὸς τὰς ἐπιφερομένας διαβολάς. (5) οἳ καὶ παρελθόντες εἰς τὴν σύγκλητον ἐνδεχομένως ἔδοξαν πρὸς ἅπαντας τοὺς κατηγοροῦντας ποιήσασθαι τὴν ἀπολογίαν, καὶ τέλος οὐ μόνον ἀποτριψάμενοι τὰς ἐπιφερομένας αἰτίας, ἀλλὰ καὶ τιμηθέντες ἐπανῆλθον εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν. (6) οὐ μὴν τῆς γε κατὰ τὸν Εὐμένη καὶ κατὰ τὸν Ἀντίοχον ὑποψίας ἔληγεν ἡ σύγκλητος, ἀλλὰ Γάιον Σολπίκιον καὶ Μάνιον Σέργιον καταστήσασα πρεσβευτὰς ἐξαπέστελλεν, (7) ἅμα μὲν ἐποπτεύσοντας τὰ κατὰ τοὺς Ἕλληνας, ἅμα δὲ τοῖς Μεγαλοπολίταις καὶ τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις διευκρινήσοντας περὶ τῆς ἀντιλεγομένης χώρας, (8) μάλιστα δὲ πολυπραγμονήσοντας τὰ κατὰ τὸν Ἀντίοχον καὶ τὰ

4. For the citing of precedents as the basis for a new judgement, cf. the dispute between Delphi and Amphissa (**163**) and that between Samos and Priene (**26**, **74**, **160**).

5. Daux, *Delphes*, p. 338.

In fact, we hear of more than one early arbitration between Thronion and Skarphai. Late in the second century the Thronians appealed to the judgement of Amphissa, while the Skarphaians put forth that of Athens and the Amphiktyony itself.[4] It is interesting to note that Thronion claims the earlier judgement of Amphissa to have been made in accordance with Amphiktyonic law, while Skarphai, notwithstanding, also appeals to an Amphiktyonic judgement. In Skarphai's view, the earlier judgements of Athens and the Amphiktyony, which were in keeping with a Roman communication, ought to be upheld. It is likely that the Roman participation in the matter had to do with general rulings on the broader questions of the administration of the Delphic Amphiktyony, rather than the specific issues involving Thronion and Skarphai.[5]

134. The Roman senate mediates between Eumenes II and Prousias II (164–160)

I: Polybios 31.1.3–8.
II: Diodoros 31.7.2.
III: Polybios 31.32.1–2.
IV: Polybios 32.1.5–6.

McShane, pp. 185–86; Errington, *Dawn*, pp. 244f.; Hansen[2], pp. 124f.; Will, vol. 2, pp. 380ff.; Sherwin-White, pp. 37f.

I: Polybios 31.1.3–8

Συνέβαινε γὰρ τὸν Προυσίαν οὐ μόνον αὐτὸν ἐνεργῶς κεχρῆσθαι ταῖς διαβολαῖς ταῖς κατὰ τὸν Εὐμένη καὶ τὸν Ἀντίοχον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς Γαλάτας παρωξυκέναι καὶ τοὺς Σελγεῖς καὶ πλείους ἑτέρους κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν πρὸς τὴν αὐτὴν ὑπόθεσιν. (4) ὧν χάριν ὁ βασιλεὺς Εὐμένης ἐξαπεστάλκει τοὺς ἀδελφούς, ἀπολογησομένους πρὸς τὰς ἐπιφερομένας διαβολάς. (5) οἳ καὶ παρελθόντες εἰς τὴν σύγκλητον ἐνδεχομένως ἔδοξαν πρὸς ἅπαντας τοὺς κατηγοροῦντας ποιήσασθαι τὴν ἀπολογίαν, καὶ τέλος οὐ μόνον ἀποτριψάμενοι τὰς ἐπιφερομένας αἰτίας, ἀλλὰ καὶ τιμηθέντες ἐπανῆλθον εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν. (6) οὐ μὴν τῆς γε κατὰ τὸν Εὐμένη καὶ κατὰ τὸν Ἀντίοχον ὑποψίας ἔληγεν ἡ σύγκλητος, ἀλλὰ Γάιον Σολπίκιον καὶ Μάνιον Σέργιον καταστήσασα πρεσβευτὰς ἐξαπέστελλεν, (7) ἅμα μὲν ἐποπτεύσοντας τὰ κατὰ τοὺς Ἕλληνας, ἅμα δὲ τοῖς Μεγαλοπολίταις καὶ τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις διευκρινήσοντας περὶ τῆς ἀντιλεγομένης χώρας, (8) μάλιστα δὲ πολυπραγμονήσοντας τὰ κατὰ τὸν Ἀντίοχον καὶ τὰ

4. For the citing of precedents as the basis for a new judgement, cf. the dispute between Delphi and Amphissa (**163**) and that between Samos and Priene (**26**, **74**, **160**).

5. Daux, *Delphes*, p. 338.

κατὰ τὸν Εὐμένη, μή τις ἐξ αὐτῶν παρασκευὴ γίνεται καὶ κοινοπραγία κατὰ Ῥωμαίων.

II: Diodoros 31.7.2

Ὅτι κατὰ τοὺς αὐτοὺς χρόνους πολλῶν παραγεγονότων πρεσβευτῶν, πρώτοις τοῖς περὶ Ἄτταλον ἐχρημάτισεν ἡ σύγκλητος· ὑπόπτως γὰρ εἶχον οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι τὰ πρὸς τὸν Εὐμένη ἕνεκεν τῶν γραμμάτων τῶν εὑρημένων, ἐν οἷς συμμαχίαν ἦν συντεθειμένος πρὸς Περσέα κατὰ Ῥωμαίων. κατηγορησάντων δὲ πλειόνων ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀσίας πρεσβευτῶν καὶ μάλιστα τῶν ἀπεσταλμένων παρὰ Προυσίου βασιλέως καὶ Γαλατῶν, οἱ περὶ τὸν Ἄτταλον ἐνδεχομένως ἀπολογησάμενοι πρὸς ἕκαστον τῶν ἐγκαλουμένων οὐ μόνον ἀπετρίψαντο τὰς διαβολάς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τιμηθέντες ἐπανῆλθον εἰς τὴν οἰκείαν. ἡ δὲ σύγκλητος οὐ κατὰ πᾶν ἔλυγε τῆς κατ' Εὐμένους ὑποψίας, προχειριαμένη δὲ Γάϊον ἐξαπέστειλε κατοπτεύσοντα τὰ κατὰ τὸν Εὐμένη.

III: Polybios 31.32.1–2

Ὅτι κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν Προυσίας μὲν ἐξέπεμψεν εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην πρεσβευτὰς μετὰ Γαλατῶν τοὺς κατηγορήσοντας Εὐμένους, (2) οὗτος δὲ πάλιν τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἄτταλον ἐξαπέστειλεν ἀπολογησόμενον πρὸς τὰς διαβολάς.

IV: Polybios 32.1.5–6

Μετὰ δὲ τούτους Ἀττάλου παραγενηθέντος, ἤδη τῶν ὑπάτων τὰς ἀρχὰς εἰληφότων, καὶ τῶν Γαλατῶν αὐτοῦ κατηγορησάντων, οὓς ἀπεστάλκει Προυσίας, (6) ⟨καὶ⟩ πλειόνων ἑτέρων ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀσίας, διακούσασα πάντων ἡ σύγκλητος οὐ μόνον ἀπέλυσε τῶν διαβολῶν τὸν Ἄτταλον, ἀλλὰ καὶ προσαυξήσασα τοῖς φιλανθρώποις ἐξαπέστειλε.

This series of literary references is evidence for some of the final "judicial" hearings that Rome undertook between Eumenes and his enemies. The Roman position is legally presented as that of a judge: the senate listened to accusations and heard a defense. But in reality these accusations were all presented to the senate in the first place because Rome, in the wake of the Third Macedonian War, was now perceived as less friendly to Eumenes, and open to hearing complaints against him. Prousias II began to exploit Eumenes' reduced popularity at Rome to his own advantage, and the Romans, nervous at Eumenes' alliances with Cappadocia and the Seleukids, were ready to listen. Nevertheless, despite their alleged distrust of both Eumenes and Antiochos, the senate initially took no action. The envoys who were sent out were received courteously and returned to Rome with no firm evidence of an anti-Roman coalition. The following year, however, 164/3, Prousias continued to accuse Eumenes before the senate and instigated accusations from others as well: the Galatians, the Selgians, and other unnamed embassies. Eumenes' two ever-useful brothers, Attalos and Athenaios,

went to Rome, and their defense apparently satisfied the senate: Polybios says that they managed to free Eumenes from the charges. But senatorial suspicions continued: the legates Sulpicius and Sergius, who had been detailed to arbitrate between Sparta and Megalopolis that year (**135**), were also requested to go to Asia and enquire into the doings of Antiochos and Eumenes. While in Asia Sulpicius advertised for anyone who wished to bring charges against Eumenes to do so within a set period of time. He gave audience to all those who brought accusations against the king, but there was still nothing to justify an open break between Rome and Pergamon.

Prousias and the Galatians continued to bring charges against Eumenes before the Romans up until the end of his life. The issue continued to be Eumenes' interference in Galatia in spite of the Roman declaration of its independence.[1] In 160, embassies from both sides in the dispute were arguing their cases in Rome. Attalos, always Eumenes' best man in Rome, and by now his co-regent,[2] answered the charges. The Pergamene king, through the agency of his brother, was acquitted. Roman relations with Eumenes had clearly deteriorated in the wake of the Third Macedonian War. There were at least some senators who were quite happy to embarrass the Pergamene king by openly favouring his brother, even if this was not official senatorial policy. But Prousias seems to have miscalculated in his efforts to exploit the perceived Roman hostility to Eumenes.[3] The senate, after all, repeatedly dismissed the complaints against him. Still, this complex of "judicial hearings" in the senate does emphasize that the Roman-Pergamene relationship in the 160s was certainly lacking in the overwhelming fellowship of the post-Apameia period, when all Eumenes had to do was ask, and it would be given.

135. Roman legates arbitrate between Sparta and Megalopolis (163)

I: Polybios 31.1.6–7.
II: Pausanias 7.11.1–2.
III: The inscription from Olympia cited in **137**, which deals with Sparta's refusal to accept an arbitration between it and Megalopolis, contains a few lines of relevance to the present case.

For bibliographic references, see the works cited in **136** and **137**.

1. See Hansen[2], p. 126.
2. Hansen[2], p. 127; Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 3, p. 516.
3. See Sherwin-White, pp. 37–38.

went to Rome, and their defense apparently satisfied the senate: Polybios says that they managed to free Eumenes from the charges. But senatorial suspicions continued: the legates Sulpicius and Sergius, who had been detailed to arbitrate between Sparta and Megalopolis that year (**135**), were also requested to go to Asia and enquire into the doings of Antiochos and Eumenes. While in Asia Sulpicius advertised for anyone who wished to bring charges against Eumenes to do so within a set period of time. He gave audience to all those who brought accusations against the king, but there was still nothing to justify an open break between Rome and Pergamon.

Prousias and the Galatians continued to bring charges against Eumenes before the Romans up until the end of his life. The issue continued to be Eumenes' interference in Galatia in spite of the Roman declaration of its independence.[1] In 160, embassies from both sides in the dispute were arguing their cases in Rome. Attalos, always Eumenes' best man in Rome, and by now his co-regent,[2] answered the charges. The Pergamene king, through the agency of his brother, was acquitted. Roman relations with Eumenes had clearly deteriorated in the wake of the Third Macedonian War. There were at least some senators who were quite happy to embarrass the Pergamene king by openly favouring his brother, even if this was not official senatorial policy. But Prousias seems to have miscalculated in his efforts to exploit the perceived Roman hostility to Eumenes.[3] The senate, after all, repeatedly dismissed the complaints against him. Still, this complex of "judicial hearings" in the senate does emphasize that the Roman-Pergamene relationship in the 160s was certainly lacking in the overwhelming fellowship of the post-Apameia period, when all Eumenes had to do was ask, and it would be given.

135. Roman legates arbitrate between Sparta and Megalopolis (163)

I: Polybios 31.1.6–7.
II: Pausanias 7.11.1–2.
III: The inscription from Olympia cited in **137**, which deals with Sparta's refusal to accept an arbitration between it and Megalopolis, contains a few lines of relevance to the present case.

For bibliographic references, see the works cited in **136** and **137**.

1. See Hansen[2], p. 126.
2. Hansen[2], p. 127; Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 3, p. 516.
3. See Sherwin-White, pp. 37–38.

I: Polybios 31.1.6–7

Ἡ σύγκλητος.... Γαίον Σολπίκιον καὶ Μάνιον Σέργιον κατασταθέντας πρεσβευτὰς ἐξαπέστειλεν, (7) ἅμα μὲν ἐποπτεύσοντας τὰ κατὰ τοὺς Ἕλληνας, ἅμα δὲ τοῖς Μεγαλοπολίταις καὶ τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις διευκρινήσοντας περὶ τῆς ἀντιλεγομένης χώρας....

II: Pausanias 7.11.1–2

Ῥωμαῖοι δὲ αὖθις ἄνδρα ἐκ τῆς βουλῆς καταπέμπουσιν ἐς τὴν Ἑλλάδα· ὄνομα μὲν τῷ ἀνδρὶ ἦν Γάλλος, ἀπέσταλτο δὲ Λακεδαιμονίοις καὶ Ἀργείοις ὑπὲρ γῆς ἀμφισβητουμένης γενέσθαι δικαστής. οὗτος ὁ Γάλλος ἐς τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν πολλὰ μὲν εἶπε, πολλὰ δὲ καὶ ἔπραξεν ὑπερήφανα, Λακεδαιμονίους δὲ καὶ Ἀργείους τὸ παράπαν ἔθετο ἐν χλευασίᾳ· (2) πόλεσι γὰρ ἐς τοσοῦτο ἡκούσαις ἀξιώματος καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ὅρων τῆς χώρας τὰ μὲν παλαιότερα ἐς οὐκ ἀφανῆ πόλεμον καὶ ἔργα οὕτως ἀφειδῆ προαχθείσαις, κριθείσαις δὲ καὶ ὕστερον παρὰ δικαστῇ κοινῷ Φιλίππῳ τῷ Ἀμύντου, αὐτὸς μέν σφισιν ὁ Γάλλος ἀπηξίωσε δικαστὴς καταστῆναι, Καλλικράτει δὲ ἁπάσης τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἀνδρὶ ἀλάστορι ἐπιτρέπει τὴν κρίσιν.

III: The Olympia inscription (lines 41–46)

ἀλλ' ὅρον ἔχοι τᾶς ποθ' αὐτοὺς διαφορᾶς κρίσιν δικ[αστ]η-
[ρίου, ἐ]γνωκότες δὲ ἐκ τ[ῶ]ν παρατε[θ]έντων ἁμῖν παρ' ἀμφοτέρ[ων γραμ]-
[μάτων] καὶ Ῥωμαίους τοὺς προεστακότας τᾶς τῶν Ἑλλάν[ων εὐνομί]-
[ας καὶ ὁμο]νοίας, ὅκ[α π]αρεγενήθησα[ν] ποθ' αὐτοὺς Μεγ[αλοπολῖται]
[καὶ Λακεδαιμόνιοι ὑπ]ὲρ ταύτας τᾶς χώρας διαφε[ρόμενοι, ταύταν]
[ἀποφάνασθαι τὰν] γνώμαν, διότι δεῖ τὰ [κεκριμένα εἶμεν κύρια . . . .]

At the beginning of 163 the legates G. Sulpicius Gallus and Manius Sergius were sent east to observe matters in Greece and Asia. One of their tasks, according to Polybios, was to arbitrate the question of a piece of territory claimed by both Sparta and Megalopolis.[1] Polybios has no more to say on the matter, but a passage in Pausanias may deal with the mission of Sulpicius and Sergius to arbitrate this dispute. Pausanias says that Gallus was sent to Greece to arbitrate between Sparta and Argos, again over a disputed territory. Many have chosen to view the appearance of Argos here as incorrect, stemming from a confusion on the part of Pausanias or his source, and have preferred to correct it to Arkadia.[2] If the Pausanias passage does refer to the Sparta-Megalopolis dispute, which is by no means certain, it could add some further evidence. Pausanias says that Gallus, contemptuous of Greek opinion, handed the case over to the Achaian Kallikrates. Pausanias's view of events is of course jaundiced. Kallikrates was a villain in the pages of both Polybios and Pausanias. But he had shown in the past

1. For the identification of this land, see the speculations in **137**.
2. See Berard 5; Raeder 27; Colin, p. 499; Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 3, p. 465. But see also **136**.

that he was not untalented in dealing diplomatically with the problems between Sparta and the Achaian League.[3] Furthermore, Rome's decision to refer the issue back to the Achaian League was in keeping with many of their previous judgements on the matter of intra-League arbitration. They had not shown themselves to be particularly vigorous in the past in carrying out mediation or arbitration between the League and its unhappy member Sparta. From the Achaian point of view, it was only right that matters relating to a dispute within the federal *koinon* should be referred back to them.

The third piece of evidence for Roman involvement in the Sparta-Megalopolis dispute in 164/3 comes from the slightly later inscription from Olympia recording yet another stage in the territorial conflict between the two (**137**). The later arbitrating commission favoured upholding the status quo, as the Romans had before them. No mention is made in the inscription of the Romans delegating the task to Kallikrates.

136. Roman legates arbitrate between Sparta and Argos (?) (163)

Pausanias 7.11.1–2.

Swoboda, *Klio* 12 (1912) p. 33; Larsen (Frank), p. 289; Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 2, p. 173; Piper, pp. 134–35, 214–15; D. A. Bowman, *AHB* 6.3 (1992) pp. 95–102.

Ῥωμαῖοι δὲ αὖθις ἄνδρα ἐκ τῆς βουλῆς καταπέμπουσιν ἐς τὴν Ἑλλάδα· ὄνομα μὲν τῷ ἀνδρὶ ἦν Γάλλος, ἀπέσταλτο δὲ Λακεδαιμονίοις καὶ Ἀργείοις ὑπὲρ γῆς ἀμφισβητουμένης γενέσθαι δικαστής. οὗτος ὁ Γάλλος ἐς τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν πολλὰ μὲν εἶπε, πολλὰ δὲ καὶ ἔπραξεν ὑπερήφανα, Λακεδαιμονίους δὲ καὶ Ἀργείους τὸ παράπαν ἔθετο ἐν χλευασίᾳ· (2) πόλεσι γὰρ ἐς τοσοῦτο ἠκούσαις ἀξιώματος καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ὅρων τῆς χώρας τὰ μὲν παλαιότερα ἐς οὐκ ἀφανῆ πόλεμον καὶ ἔργα οὕτως ἀφειδῆ προαχθείσαις, κριθείσαις δὲ καὶ ὕστερον παρὰ δικαστῇ κοινῷ Φιλίππῳ τῷ Ἀμύντου, αὐτὸς μέν σφισιν ὁ Γάλλος ἀπηξίωσε δικαστὴς καταστῆναι, Καλλικράτει δὲ ἁπάσης τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἀνδρὶ ἀλάστορι ἐπιτρέπει τὴν κρίσιν.

Pausanias reports that in 163 the Roman senator Gallus was sent to the Peloponnese to deal with a territorial dispute between Sparta and Argos. In Pausanias's account, Gallus displays his arrogance and contempt for the faith the Greeks had placed in Rome by passing the task of arbitration on to the Achaian Kallikrates, the "bane of all Greece." It is possible that Pausanias has mistakenly substituted an arbitration with Argos for one we know from other

3. Kallikrates' restoration of the Spartan exiles in 180 is the last we hear of any major dispute between Sparta and the Achaians until the time of the Achaian War (**147**).

that he was not untalented in dealing diplomatically with the problems between Sparta and the Achaian League.[3] Furthermore, Rome's decision to refer the issue back to the Achaian League was in keeping with many of their previous judgements on the matter of intra-League arbitration. They had not shown themselves to be particularly vigorous in the past in carrying out mediation or arbitration between the League and its unhappy member Sparta. From the Achaian point of view, it was only right that matters relating to a dispute within the federal *koinon* should be referred back to them.

The third piece of evidence for Roman involvement in the Sparta-Megalopolis dispute in 164/3 comes from the slightly later inscription from Olympia recording yet another stage in the territorial conflict between the two (**137**). The later arbitrating commission favoured upholding the status quo, as the Romans had before them. No mention is made in the inscription of the Romans delegating the task to Kallikrates.

136. Roman legates arbitrate between Sparta and Argos (?) (163)

Pausanias 7.11.1–2.

Swoboda, *Klio* 12 (1912) p. 33; Larsen (Frank), p. 289; Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 2, p. 173; Piper, pp. 134–35, 214–15; D. A. Bowman, *AHB* 6.3 (1992) pp. 95–102.

Ῥωμαῖοι δὲ αὖθις ἄνδρα ἐκ τῆς βουλῆς καταπέμπουσιν ἐς τὴν Ἑλλάδα· ὄνομα μὲν τῷ ἀνδρὶ ἦν Γάλλος, ἀπέσταλτο δὲ Λακεδαιμονίοις καὶ Ἀργείοις ὑπὲρ γῆς ἀμφισβητουμένης γενέσθαι δικαστής. οὗτος ὁ Γάλλος ἐς τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν πολλὰ μὲν εἶπε, πολλὰ δὲ καὶ ἔπραξεν ὑπερήφανα, Λακεδαιμονίους δὲ καὶ Ἀργείους τὸ παράπαν ἔθετο ἐν χλευασίᾳ· (2) πόλεσι γὰρ ἐς τοσοῦτο ἠκούσαις ἀξιώματος καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ὅρων τῆς χώρας τὰ μὲν παλαιότερα ἐς οὐκ ἀφανῆ πόλεμον καὶ ἔργα οὕτως ἀφειδῆ προαχθείσαις, κριθείσαις δὲ καὶ ὕστερον παρὰ δικαστῇ κοινῷ Φιλίππῳ τῷ Ἀμύντου, αὐτὸς μέν σφισιν ὁ Γάλλος ἀπηξίωσε δικαστὴς καταστῆναι, Καλλικράτει δὲ ἁπάσης τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἀνδρὶ ἀλάστορι ἐπιτρέπει τὴν κρίσιν.

Pausanias reports that in 163 the Roman senator Gallus was sent to the Peloponnese to deal with a territorial dispute between Sparta and Argos. In Pausanias's account, Gallus displays his arrogance and contempt for the faith the Greeks had placed in Rome by passing the task of arbitration on to the Achaian Kallikrates, the "bane of all Greece." It is possible that Pausanias has mistakenly substituted an arbitration with Argos for one we know from other

3. Kallikrates' restoration of the Spartan exiles in 180 is the last we hear of any major dispute between Sparta and the Achaians until the time of the Achaian War (**147**).

evidence to have taken place with Megalopolis in this year.[1] But beyond the coincidence of timing, there is no reason to reject an arbitration between Argos and Sparta in 163.[2] Their history of territorial disputes went back centuries. The regions of Kynouria and the Thyreatis were bones of contention over which the two states alternately fought and arbitrated. Philip II had ruled on the matter and had, not surprisingly, awarded the land to Argos.[3]

137. An arbitration between the Achaian League and Sparta over Sparta's dispute with Megalopolis (after 163)

A fragmented inscription discovered at Olympia. W (varying): 0.52–0.54 m; d: 0.05–0.06 m.

W. Dittenberger, *ArchZeit* 37 (1879) p. 127, no. 259; K. Purgold, *ArchZeit* 39 (1881) p. 191; M. Dubois, *Les ligues étoliennes et achéenne* (Paris, 1885) pp. 231–32, no. 14; de Ruggiero, pp. 246f., no. 5; Berard 5; Dittenberger/Purgold, *IOlympia* 47; Dittenberger, *SIG*^{2} 304; *Dittenberger/Hiller von Gaertringen, *SIG*^{3} 665.

Sonne 49, 52; de Ruggiero, pp. 155f.; Colin, p. 499; Phillipson, p. 157; Raeder 27; Swoboda, *Klio* 12 (1912) pp. 33, 37; C. D. Buck, *CPh* 8 (1913) pp. 150–51; Tod 2; Steinwenter, pp. 179f.; J. A. O. Larsen, *CPh* 30 (1935) p. 206; Roebuck, Diss., pp. 53–56; P. Treves, *JHS* 64 (1944) pp. 105–6; Roebuck, *CPh*, pp. 85–92; Larsen, *Representative Government*, p. 210; Larsen (Frank), p. 289; Préaux, pp. 251f., 290f.; Larsen, *GFS*, p. 485; Piccirilli 60; E. S. Gruen, *JHS* 96 (1976) pp. 50f., 55; Taeuber, p. 35; Gruen, p. 108; Bastini, p. 184; Daverio Rocchi, pp. 199–201.

Ἀπόφαcιc δικαcτᾶν [περὶ χώρας ἀμφιλλεγομένας, τῶν αἱρεθέντων]
δικάcαι τοῖc Ἀχαιοῖc κ[αὶ τοῖc Λακεδαιμονίοις, . . . 13 . . .]
τοῦ Ἐπιγόνου, Ἀριcτάρχου [τοῦ - - - -, - - - - τοῦ . . . ἀν]-
δρου, Πολυκράτευc τοῦ Πολυ[- - -, - - - - τοῦ - - - -, καὶ]
περὶ τᾶc ζαμίας ἃc ἐζαμίωca[ν . . . 15 . . . τὸν δᾶμον τὸν Λα]-
κεδαιμονίων, ὅτι ἀντιπο[ε]ῖτ[αι . . . 16 . . . τῶι δάμωι τῶι]
Μεγαλοπολιτᾶν ταύτας τᾶc [χώρας . . . 17 . . . λόγων δὲ]
πλειόνων ῥηθέντων, ἐπεὶ πολ . . . . 29 . . . .
τας διὰ τῶν cυνδίκων, καὶ τὰμ [μὲν ὑπάρχουcαν ἐκ πολλοῦ χρόνου]
διαφορὰν ταῖc πόλεcι δί [δλ]ο[υ . . . . . διαλῦcαι ἐπειρακάμεθα,]

1. See the discussion in **135**.

2. Bowman argues that Pausanias's account is accurate and that its disagreement with Polyb. 31.1.6–7 simply reflects the fact that the two authors were speaking of two different embassies; Bowman speculates that Pausanias's "Gallos" was L. Anicius Gallus, on an embassy to the East in 155/4.

3. Polyb. 9.28.7; Paus. 2.20.1. See Roebuck, *CPh*; Piccirilli 60.

evidence to have taken place with Megalopolis in this year.[1] But beyond the coincidence of timing, there is no reason to reject an arbitration between Argos and Sparta in 163.[2] Their history of territorial disputes went back centuries. The regions of Kynouria and the Thyreatis were bones of contention over which the two states alternately fought and arbitrated. Philip II had ruled on the matter and had, not surprisingly, awarded the land to Argos.[3]

137. An arbitration between the Achaian League and Sparta over Sparta's dispute with Megalopolis (after 163)

A fragmented inscription discovered at Olympia. W (varying): 0.52–0.54 m; d: 0.05–0.06 m.

W. Dittenberger, *ArchZeit* 37 (1879) p. 127, no. 259; K. Purgold, *ArchZeit* 39 (1881) p. 191; M. Dubois, *Les ligues étoliennes et achéenne* (Paris, 1885) pp. 231–32, no. 14; de Ruggiero, pp. 246f., no. 5; Berard 5; Dittenberger/Purgold, *IOlympia* 47; Dittenberger, *SIG*^{2} 304; *Dittenberger/Hiller von Gaertringen, *SIG*^{3} 665.

Sonne 49, 52; de Ruggiero, pp. 155f.; Colin, p. 499; Phillipson, p. 157; Raeder 27; Swoboda, *Klio* 12 (1912) pp. 33, 37; C. D. Buck, *CPh* 8 (1913) pp. 150–51; Tod 2; Steinwenter, pp. 179f.; J. A. O. Larsen, *CPh* 30 (1935) p. 206; Roebuck, Diss., pp. 53–56; P. Treves, *JHS* 64 (1944) pp. 105–6; Roebuck, *CPh*, pp. 85–92; Larsen, *Representative Government*, p. 210; Larsen (Frank), p. 289; Préaux, pp. 251f., 290f.; Larsen, *GFS*, p. 485; Piccirilli 60; E. S. Gruen, *JHS* 96 (1976) pp. 50f., 55; Taeuber, p. 35; Gruen, p. 108; Bastini, p. 184; Daverio Rocchi, pp. 199–201.

Ἀπόφαcιc δικαcτᾶν [περὶ χώρας ἀμφιλλεγομένας, τῶν αἱρεθέντων]
δικάcαι τοῖc Ἀχαιοῖc κ[αὶ τοῖc Λακεδαιμονίοις, . . . 13 . . .]
τοῦ Ἐπιγόνου, Ἀριcτάρχου [τοῦ - - - -, - - - - τοῦ . . . ἀν]-
δρου, Πολυκράτευc τοῦ Πολυ[- - -, - - - - τοῦ - - - -, καὶ]
περὶ τᾶc ζαμίας ἃc ἐζαμίωca[ν . . . 15 . . . τὸν δᾶμον τὸν Λα]-
κεδαιμονίων, ὅτι ἀντιπο[ε]ῖτ[αι . . . 16 . . . τῶι δάμωι τῶι]
Μεγαλοπολιτᾶν ταύτας τᾶc [χώρας . . . 17 . . . λόγων δὲ]
πλειόνων ῥηθέντων, ἐπεὶ πολ . . . . 29 . . . .
τας διὰ τῶν cυνδίκων, καὶ τὰμ [μὲν ὑπάρχουcαν ἐκ πολλοῦ χρόνου]
διαφορὰν ταῖc πόλεcι δί [δλ]ο[υ . . . . . διαλῦcαι ἐπειρακάμεθα,]

1. See the discussion in **135**.

2. Bowman argues that Pausanias's account is accurate and that its disagreement with Polyb. 31.1.6–7 simply reflects the fact that the two authors were speaking of two different embassies; Bowman speculates that Pausanias's "Gallos" was L. Anicius Gallus, on an embassy to the East in 155/4.

3. Polyb. 9.28.7; Paus. 2.20.1. See Roebuck, *CPh*; Piccirilli 60.

προθυμίας καὶ σπουδᾶς οὐθὲν [ἐλλείποντες· . .14 . . οὐκ ἀ]-
πηνέγκαμεν ἐπιγραφὰν διὰ πο[λλ]οῦ, ἕνεκεν τοῦ χρόνον ἱκα[νὸν]
δοθ[ῆ]μεν εἰς σύλλυσιν τοῖς δια[φερ]ομέ[ν]οις· ἐπε[ὶ] δὲ ἀναγκαῖόν [τε]
καὶ ἀκόλουθ[ον τῶι ὅρ]κωι ὃν [ὠ]μ[όσα]μεν καὶ τοῖς νόμοις τοῖς τῶν Ἀ-
χαιῶ[ν] c[υ]ντε[λ]ε(cθεῖca)ν τὰν κρίcιν [εἰc] τὰ γράμματα τὰ δαμόcια ἀπε-
νεγχ[θῆ]-
μεν, ἕνεκεν τοῦ μήτε τὰ ποτιδε[ό]μενα κρίcιος ἄκριτα γίνεcθαι μή-
τε τὰ κεκριμένα ἄκυρα, ὅπως δα[μ]οκρατούμενοι καὶ τὰ ποθ' αὐτοὺc
ὁμονοοῦντες οἱ Ἀχαιοὶ διατε[λ]ῶντι εἰc τὸν ἀεὶ χρόνον ὄντες ἐν εἰ-
ράναι καὶ εὐνομίαι, αἵ τ' ἐν τοῖ[c] Ἕλλαcιν καὶ cυμμάχοις γεγενημέ-
ναι πρότερον [κ]ρ[ί]cεις βέβαια[ι] καὶ ἀκήρατοι δ[ι]αμένωντι εἰc τὸ[ν]
ἀεὶ χρόνον κα[ὶ] αἱ cτᾶλαι καὶ τ[ὰ ὅρι]α τὰ τε[θ]έ[ντα] ὑπὲρ τᾶν κρι[cί]-
ωμ μένῃ κύρια δί ὅλου καὶ μηδὲ[ν αὐτῶν ἦι] ἰcχυ[ρότ]ερον, γεγεν[ημέ]-
νας καὶ πρότε[ρ]ον κρίcιος Μεγ[αλοπολίταις καὶ Λακεδ]αιμον[ίοις]
[ὑπὲ]ρ ταύ[τας τᾶ]c χώρας, ὑπὲρ ἃc [νῦν διαφέρονται, . . . 14 . . .]
. . . 11 . . . ων τῶι προδίκωι -
- - - - - - -cτα κατακολουθ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
[- - - - - ἐν] Μεγάλαι πόλει ἐ[ν τῶι ἀρχείωι - - - - - - -]
[- - - - - - ἐ]ν τῶι ἀcύλ[ω]ι κ[αὶ - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
[- - - - - -μ]έναιc εὖ ὑ[πὸ Μ]ε[γαλοπολιτᾶν - - - - - - - - -]
[- - - ὑπὸ τῶ]ν cυμμάχων αἱρε[θέντες . . 9 . . κρ]ιτα[ὶ . . . . .]
[. . 9 . . ἀμφοτ]έ[ρ]ων ἐπιτρε[ψάντων, εἰ δοκεῖ τὰ]ν Cκιρῖ[τιν κατέ]-
[χεcθαι ὑπὸ Μεγαλοπο]λιτᾶν—ἐν ἃι κ[αὶ ἁ Αἰγῦτι]c χώρα—ἢ ὑ[πὸ Λακεδαι]-
[μονίων, καὶ ὁρικ]μὸc τᾶc χώρας ἀπ[ογεγραμμένο]c, καὶ ὅτι ὤμοc[αν αἱρήcε-]
[cθαι ἐκ πά]ντων ἀριcτίνδαν, κ[αὶ ὅτι ἔκριν]αν οἱ δικαcταὶ [γενέcθαι]
[τὰν Cκιρ]ῖτιν καὶ τὰν Αἰγῦτιν Ἀρ[κάδων ἀπὸ] τοῦ τοὺc Ἡρακλείδας εἰc
[Πε]λοπόνναcον κατελθεῖν, καὶ [ὁ ὅρκοc] τὸν [ὀ]μόcαντεc οἱ δικαcταὶ ἐ-
[δ]ίκαcαν, καὶ τῶν δικαcάντων τὰ {ὀνό}ματα, οἳ ἦcαν τῶι πλήθει ἑκατὸν
[κα]ὶ εἷc, καὶ οἱ παρόντεc Λακεδα[ιμ]ονίων ἐπὶ τοῦ ὅρκου. κρίνοντεc
[οὖν ο]ὕ[τ]ω κα μάλιcτα μένειν [τὰ ποθ'] αὐτοὺc τοὺc Ἀχαιοὺc ὁμονοοῦν-
[τας, εἰ] τὰ κριθέντα παρ' αὐτοῖc μηκέτι γίνοιτο ἄκυρα δί ἑτέρων ἐγ-
[κλημά]των, ἀλλ' ὅρον ἔχοι τᾶc ποθ' αὐτοὺc διαφορᾶc κρίcιν δικ[αcτ]η-
[ρίου, ἐ]γνωκότεc δὲ ἐκ τ[ῶ]ν παρατε[θ]έντων ἁμῖν παρ' ἀμφοτέρ[ων γραμ-
[μάτων] καὶ Ῥωμαίουc τοὺc προεcτακότας τᾶc τῶν Ἑλλάν[ων εὐνομί]-
[ac καὶ ὁμο]νοίας, ὅκ[α π]αρεγενήθηca[ν] ποθ' αὐτοὺc Μεγ[αλοπολῖται]
[καὶ Λακεδαιμόνιοι ὑπ]ὲρ ταύτας τᾶc χώρας διαφε[ρόμενοι, ταύταν]
[ἀποφάνacθαι τὰν] γνώμαν, διότι δεῖ τὰ [κεκριμένα εἶμεν κύρια . . . .]
- - - - - - - - - - -αι- -
[- - - - - - - - - κρ]ί[c]ιν κα[ὶ - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
[- - - - - - - - - -μ]ένας πόλιο[c - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
[- - - - - - - - - - κ]ρίcειc πα- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
[- - - - - - - - τὰν ζα]μίαν ἂν ἐζ[αμίωcαν - - - - - - - - - -]
[- - - - - - - - - ὑπό]δικον εἶμε[ν - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
[τᾶι πόλει τ]ᾶι Λακεδαιμ[ονίων.]

1: ἡ[ιρημένων - - δια]|δικάcαι: Berard, Dubois. || 4: Πολυ[κράτευc]: Berard. || 5: ἐζαμί[ωcαν οἱ Ἀχαιοὶ: Berard; Dubois; Dittenberger, *Archζeit* 37. || 15:

c[υ]ντε[λ]ε[ῖ]ν τὰν κρίcιν, [⟨ὥcτ'⟩ εἰc] τὰ γράμματα: *IOlympia*. || 17–18: [-πόλ]|εμον [- - οἱ] Ἀχαιοὶ διατε[λῶcιν]: Berard; Dubois; Dittenberger, *ArchZeit* 37. || 19–20: [ἵν' αἱ γεγενημέ]|ναι ὕcτερον κρίcεις βεβαίαι διαμένων[τι καὶ κυρίαι]: Berard. || 21–22: τ[ὰ ψηφίcματα τῶν Ἀχαι]|ῶμ: Berard, Dubois. || 22: μηθὲ[ν]: *IOlympia*. || 31–32: [κατεc|χῆcθαι]: *IOlympia*. || 33: ὅ[ρ]oc τᾶc χώραc: Berard; Dubois; Dittenberger, *ArchZeit* 37. || 34: [Μεγαλοπο]λιτᾶν ἀριcτίνδαν κ[αὶ πλουντίνδαν]: Berard, Dubois. || 35: [τὰν Βελμινᾶτ]ιν καὶ τὰν Αἰγῦτιν: Berard; Dubois; Dittenberger, *ArchZeit* 37. || 44: ποθ' αὐτοὺc a mistake for ποτ' αὐτοὺc: Dittenberger.

Despite the numerous difficulties arising from the fragmentation of this text, it contributes much to the understanding of the enduring dispute between Sparta and Megalopolis, a dispute that was exacerbated in the second century by the bad relations between Sparta and the Achaian League. In early 163 Rome sent out legates to Greece; part of their mandate was to arbitrate a territorial dispute between Sparta and Megalopolis (**135**). Although Polybios (31.1.7) does not identify the disputed land, it seems reasonable to suppose that it was in fact the same region that was consistently claimed by both sides, that is, the regions of Belbina (Belmina), Skiritis, and Aigytis. Polybios says only that the Romans were sent to arbitrate the quarrel; Pausanias, if his evidence (7.11) does refer to the Sparta-Megalopolis conflict, adds the further touch that the Roman legates referred that task to the Achaian Kallikrates.[1] In any case, whether the dispute between the two members of the Achaian League was arbitrated by representatives of Rome or of Achaia, the inscription from Olympia shows that Megalopolis won its case in 163 and furthermore that Sparta was unwilling to accept that verdict. The present arbitration was over Sparta's refusal to cooperate. Sparta had lost the land in 188, but the complex of arbitrations around 163 and later indicate that it must have continued some occupation of the land, or reoccupied it at some later date. Part of the issue in the Olympia inscription is Sparta's refusal to recognize Megalopolis's title to the land, which can only mean that Sparta was at least in partial possession of it.

We know from this inscription that a fine was imposed on Sparta. It has generally been assumed that this penalty was imposed by the League on its member Sparta because, after the arbitration of 163 had gone against it, Sparta tried again to resort to violence against Megalopolis, another member state. There is, however, no proof of violence on Sparta's part. It seems possible, rather, that the fine was imposed because Sparta rejected the terms of the judgement (by refusing to vacate whatever portion of the land it occupied). This would be a typical punishment for a state that refused to comply with

1. See **135** and **136**.

an arbitral finding after having agreed to go to arbitration in the first place.[2] It is likely (though by no means certain) that the penalty was imposed by the Achaian League; if so, this would be consistent with an Achaian involvement in the arbitration in early 163, perhaps through the participation of Kallikrates at the Roman request.

Although some personal names of the five judges involved in the arbitration recorded in the Olympia inscription have survived, the provenance of these men is unknown. The identity of the disputants, however, is clear: Sparta and the Achaian League, rather than Sparta and Megalopolis. Various references are made to the land dispute between the latter two, but a careful reading of the inscription reveals that, formally at least, the land issue is secondary. The primary issue in this case is Sparta's refusal to accept the previous decision, as well as its refusal to pay the fine. The territorial dispute provides the background to the case, while the graver matter of the recalcitrance of a League member occupies the foreground. But the two issues are closely intertwined, and the decision of the present court (that Megalopolis was the rightful owner of the territory) clearly carried with it the corollary that the Spartans were wrong in having refused to pay the fine. Sparta's new opponent, then, was the Achaian League. This is clearly an anomalous situation in a formal arbitration, even given Sparta's often unique position vis-à-vis the League. An arbitration was required between a federal body and one of its member states, over an issue that initially arose from a dispute involving that member with another. Sparta may have been getting special treatment.

It is not impossible, though it may be unlikely, that the arbitrators came from outside the Achaian League.[3] If this were only an arbitration between Sparta and Megalopolis, the presence of another Achaian state as arbitrator would have been perfectly acceptable and customary League practice.[4] However, the presence of the League itself as in some sense a disputant would obviate the impartiality of a member state. These judges, nevertheless, attest to their objectivity and concern for both parties; they claim to have tried for a long time to reconcile the disputants, and to have been forced in the end to render a legal judgement only through the obduracy of both sides. Their chief concern seems to have been to achieve a state of long-lasting ὁμόνοια within the Achaian League.

2. Cf. **71**, **83**, **100**, **164**.

3. The Doric κοινή of the inscription indicates that a Peloponnesian provenance for the judges is perfectly likely (see Buck, *CPh* 8, pp. 150–51).

4. Cf. **38**, **46**.

138. Officials of Ptolemy VI settle disputes between Arsinoë and Troizen (between 163 and 146)

In 1969 Werner Peek pointed out that the documents from the Epidaurian Asklepieion *IG* IV^2 1.76 and 77 were probably portions of the same inscription. Both had originally been recognized as arbitration documents, but prior to Peek's realization that they belonged together it was thought that *IG* IV^2 1.76 recorded an arbitration between Arsinoë and Troizen, while 77 referred to an arbitration between Troizen and an unnamed neighbour (conjectures included Epidauros, Megara, and Hermione). The text presented here is a composite of 76 and 77, based on Peek's joining of the two (*ASAW* 60.2 [1969]). *IG* IV^2 1.77 is itself a composite, as two copies of the same document were discovered, one at Troizen, and the other in the Asklepieion at Epidauros.

A (lines 1–29): A stele discovered in the Asklepieion at Epidauros. H (max.): 0.515 m; w (max.): 0.20 m; d (max.): 0.12 m.

F. Hiller von Gaertringen, *AE* 1925–26, pp. 71–75, no. 7; *Hiller von Gaertringen, *IG* IV^2 1.76.

B (lines 30–46): Peek's union of *IG* IV^2 1.76 and 77.

*Peek, *ASAW* 60.2 (1969) pp. 27–28, no. 31.

C (lines 46–57): The two inscriptions that make up *IG* IV^2 1.77. Copy 1, from Troizen, is a stele broken at the top (h: 0.45 m; w: 0.44 m; d: 0.11 m). Copy 2, from the Asklepieion, consists of two pieces of a stele, one from the right upper corner (h: 0.19 m; w: 0.13 m; d: 0.09 m), the other from the left margin (h: 0.35 m; w: 0.16 m; d: 0.12 m). Nikitsky recognized that the two inscriptions were copies of the same text. The text cited here is Hiller von Gaertringen's copy of the Epidauros inscription, restored fully from the Troizen inscription (the latter is represented by the underlined letters).

Copy 1: P. Legrand, *BCH* 24 (1900) pp. 190f., no. 5; Fränkel, *IG* IV.752; A. Nikitsky, *ZMNP* 1902, pp. 445f. (in Russian); Schwyzer 104; Buck 88. Copy 2: Fränkel, *IG* IV.941; Nikitsky, *ZMNP* 1902; *Hiller von Gaertringen, *IG* IV^2 1.77 (restored with the help of *IG* IV.752).

F. Bechtel, *Hermes* 36 (1901) pp. 610–11; B. Haussoullier, *RPh* n.s. 25 (1901) pp. 336–38; A. Nikitsky, *Hermes* 38 (1903) pp. 406f.; Hitzig, p. 38 n. 2; Wilhelm, *Neue Beiträge* 1, pp. 28f.; Raeder 47; Swoboda, *Klio* 12 (1912) p. 34; Tod 13, 14; Steinwenter, pp. 171, 190, 192, 196; G. Welter, *Troizen und Kalaureia* (Berlin, 1941) p. 7; Robert, *REG* 1942, 57; A. Wilhelm, *AAWW* 85 (1948) pp. 69f.; *SEG* XI.406, 407; L. Robert, *Hellenica* 11–12 (1960) pp. 159–60; W. Peek, *ASAW* 60.2 (1969) pp. 27–28, nos. 31, 32; R. S. Bagnall, *The Administration of the Ptolemaic Possessions*

outside Egypt (Leiden, 1976) pp. 135–36; B. Bravo, *ASNP* 10 (1980) pp. 745–46, 805–6, 865–68; *SEG* XXX.385, 388.

A vacat
[- - ἐν Τροζᾶνι - - τ]οῦ γ΄Νίκωνος, ἐν Ἀρσι-
[νόαι δὲ ἱερέος τᾶι] Ἀθάναι Φειδοστράτου
[κατὰ τάδε ἐγένετο ἀ] ὁμολογία Τροζανίων
[καὶ Ἀρσινοέων] εἰς ἅπαντα τὸν χρόνον, v
[ἡκόντων παρ βασιλέος] Πτολεμαίου πρες- v
[βευτᾶν καὶ κριτᾶν, π]ερὶ τᾶς χώρας τᾶς καλουμέ-
[νας κοινᾶς καὶ Χερσο]νάσου καὶ Πραξωνείου, καὶ
[ταῦτα καὶ ἰσθμὸν] τὸν καὶ Στενίταν κοινὰ εἶμε[ν.]
[τᾶς δὲ τομᾶς τᾶς] λιθίνας καὶ τᾶς ξυλίνας vv
[καὶ τᾶς ἀναγωγᾶ]ς καὶ τᾶς καταγωγᾶς καὶ πα-
[ραγωγᾶς μηθαμὰ μη]θεὶς κωλυέτω τοὺς πριαμέ- v
[νους· ἀναγωγᾶς δὲ κ]αὶ καταγωγᾶς καὶ παραγωγᾶς
[μὴ κωλύειν τοὺς ἄγ]οντας, μηδὲ ἄλλο μηθὲν πράς-
[σειν τοὺς κὰτ τὰν] ἐ[ρ]γασίαν μηδὲ τὸν τὸν χάρακα
[οἰκέοντα· εἰ δὲ μή, ἁ μ]ὲν πόλις μυρίας δραχμὰς καὶ
[ὁ ἰδιώτας δὲ] χιλίας δραχμὰς καὶ ὅ,τι βασιλίδι vv
[χρὴ τελείτω. δικ]άζεσθαι μετὰ τᾶς Χερσονάσου
[καὶ τὰν καλουμέ]ναν Διαστενῖτιν ἀπό τε τοῦ κατὰ v
[τὰν χώραν τὰν] ὁρισθεῖσαν, καθὼς εὐδόκησάν πο- vv
[κα, καὶ τὸν χάρα]κα τὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ Στενίτα. τὸν δὲ vvv
[Στενίταν κα]ὶ τὰν ἐκτὸς τοῦ χάρακος χώραν vvvv
[τὰν ἀπὸ τοῦ χάρ]ακος ἐπὶ τὸν λευκὸν Ἑρμᾶν τὸν ποτ[ὶ]
[Στενίταν χώραν] κοινὰν εἶμεν στάλαις ὁρισθεῖσαν, v
[τά τε τῶν Πραξω]νείων καὶ τᾶς κοινᾶς χώρας κοινά. vv
[ἐν τᾶι κοινᾶι] χώραι τὰς κτήσεις βεβαίας εἶμεν. vv
[ὅρους δὲ θέμεν] ἀπὸ τοῦ χάρακος ἐπὶ τὸν λευκὸν vvv
[Ἑρμᾶν· τὰν δὲ χώρ]αν καὶ τὰς ἁλὰς καὶ τὸ λιμένιον v
- - - - - - - - - - - δίδ[ος]θαι δὲ ἐξαγωγὰν κατ' ἐνιαυ-
[τόν, - - - -] ἀτελέων ἐργαζομενᾶν τᾶν ἁλᾶν
B [- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - κ]α ἕληται ὁ ἐγδεξάμενος τὰς ἁλὰς
[- - - - - - - - - - - - - - ἐν τῶι] καλουμένωι Στενίται, καὶ τοὺς vv
. . ΛΙ . . . . . κατὰ πα[- - - - - ct]άλαις ὁρισθέντα· ἐξουσία δ' ἔστω
τὰν κοινὰν χώραν - - - - - - - -. ὅσα δὲ πολέμαρχοι ἢ δαμιοργοὶ vv
ἢ ἄλλος τις ἀπὸ κοινοῦ - - - - - - -ς εἴτε ἐκ τᾶς χώρας εἴτε ἐν τᾶι πό-
λει ἀποπέπραγε κε[- - - - - - - - - - ἔ]ξω τᾶν χωρᾶν ἀπότομα εἶμεν, καὶ v
μὴ δικάξασθαι μηθέν[α περὶ τούτων τῶν χ]ρημ[άτ]ων· εἰ δὲ δικαξεῖται, vv
ἅ τε δίκα ἀτελὴ[ς] ἔ[στω καὶ ἀποτεισάτω, εἰ μὲν ἰδιώτα]ς, χιλίας δραχμάς,
εἰ δὲ πόλις, μυρ[ίας. περὶ δὲ τᾶς κοινᾶς χώρας καὶ περὶ] τᾶν ἐπικαρπιᾶν
τᾶν ἐκ τᾶς χώρα[ς καὶ περὶ τᾶν ποθόδων τᾶν ἐκ τῶν θυννείων γ]ενομε[νᾶν]
ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθε[ν χρόνοις μὴ δικάξασθαι μηθένα· εἰ δ]ὲ δικάξαιτο, ἀπο[τει]-
σάτω, εἰ μὲν ἰδιώτα[ς, χιλίας δραχμάς, εἰ δὲ πόλις, μυρί]ας, καὶ ἁ δίκα ἀτελ[ὴς]
ἔστω. περὶ δὲ τ[ῶν ἐρρυτιασμένων ὑπὸ τᾶς πόλιος χωρίων κα]ὶ [οἰκ]ι[ᾶν ἢ ἀγμέ-

νων ἀπὸ τᾶς χώρα[ς ἐν ταῖς ἀνεπιβασίαις, ἀπὸ τᾶν κοιν]ᾶν ποθόδων [τᾶν]ᵛ
ἐκ τῶν θυνγε[ίων ἐπιλυθῆμεν τοὺς ἐρρυτιασμένους] στάσι ἀν' ὅ κα φέ- ᵛ
ρηι ὁ λόγος ὁ [ταμία Φιλοκλέος, καὶ τοῖς σώμασι τοῖς ἀπο]πραχθεῖσιν ᵛ [ὑ]-
C πὸ τῶν πολ[εμάρχων Ἀρτεμιδώρωι, Πύρρωι, Θεοδότωι ἑ]κάστωι ᵛ
δραχμας δι[ακοσίας ἃν Τροζάνιοι νομίζοντι, καὶ τὰ χωρία κα]ὶ τὰς οἰκία[ς],
ὅσα ἐστὶ ἐ[ρρυτιασμένα ὑπὸ τᾶς πόλιος, ἀποδόμεν τοῖς ἐρρυ]τιασμέν[οις],
ἐπιλύσαν[τας ἀπὸ τᾶγ κοινᾶν ποθόδων τοῖς πεπεμμένοις τι τ]ῶν ἐρρυς[ι]-
{σι}ασμέν[ων ὑπὸ τᾶς πόλιος. τὰς δ' ἐπιγαμίας καὶ τὰς ἐγκτάσει]ς ὑπάρχε[ιν]
ἑκατέ[ροις ποτ' ἀλλάλους εἰς ἅπαντα τὸν χρόνον. ὅπως δὲ τὰ
συμ]φωνηθ[έν]-
[τα κύρια ἦι, ἀποστειλάντω πρεσβείαν ἑκάτεροι εἰς Ἀθάνας καὶ ἀξ]ιούντ[ω]
[δόμεν αὐτοῖς ἄνδρας τρεῖς, οἵτινες παραγενόμενοι τὰ γεγονότα αὐτοῖ]ς
ὁμ[ό]-
[λογα ἐπικρίναντες ἀναθησοῦνται ἐν στάλαις εἰς τὰ ἱερὰ τό τε ἐγ
Καλαυρεί]αι τ[οῦ]
Ποσειδᾶνος καὶ τὸ ἐν Ἐπιδαύρωι τοῦ Ἀσκλαπιοῦ καὶ τὸ ἐν Ἀθάναις ἐν
ἀκροπό-
[λει τᾶς Ἀθάνας. ὅπως δὲ καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν ἐννόμως ἑ[κάτεραι αἱ] πόλεις
ἀμφοτέ-
[ραις μὲν πα- - - -

date it by the magistrates of both states and announce that these are the terms of an eternal agreement between Arsinoë and Troizen. We then learn that Ptolemy VI sent ambassadors and judges to deal with the issues in dispute between the two. The chief problems appear to have been matters of joint land, border delineation, and the use of the productive areas of the region. It may be that each side had been indulging in harrying or hindering the other in its use of the local resources. A ruling was given on the quarrying of stone and cutting of timber, as well as on the provisions for the transportation and purchase of these products. Other local resources that came in for discussion were the saltworks and the tuna fisheries.[3]

The disagreements between the two neighbours seem to have reached rather drastic proportions. Evidently there had been some cases of ῥύσια, the seizure of goods, property, and apparently slaves, as reprisal for nonpayment of debt or some such offense.[4] Part of the problem that the Ptolemaic judges had to deal with was the issue of compensation for these seizures. The solution they found, generally speaking, was to compensate injured parties by means of the proceeds from the common holdings, the land and the tuna fisheries. They further encouraged reconciliation between the states by enshrining in the agreement mutual rights of intermarriage and property ownership. As in several other cases of arbitration, there was to be a penalty for noncompliance. In this case, it was a fine of 10,000 drachmai for either of the cities, 1,000 for an individual. This money was perhaps to be paid to the royal treasury or perhaps was intended for deposit in a local temple of the deified Arsinoë.[5]

An unusual aspect of this arbitration is the fact that after the Ptolemaic judges had resolved the points of dispute and worked out the details of the reconciliation, there was still to be a further ratification of the agreement by means of the cooperation of another foreign power. Arsinoë and Troizen were each to send an embassy to Athens and request that Athens send three individuals who would make an auxiliary judgement (ἄνδρας τρεῖς, οἵτινες παραγενόμενοι τὰ γεγονότα αὐτοῖς ὁμόλογα ἐπιχρίναντες). This would presumably further secure the agreement made under Ptolemaic auspices.[6] The Athenians were also to ensure that proper publication of the agreement was made, with copies

circumstances described in **42**. The territorial dispute between Arsinoë and Epidauros (**46**) may have sprung from similar causes.

3. On the saltworks as an issue for arbitration, cf. the later arbitration between Priene and Miletos (**171**).

4. Cf. **105**, **141**.

5. Hiller von Gaertringen (*AE*, p. 74) suggested that the money would have been deposited in an Arsinoë temple; cf. the arrangements in **42**.

6. Cf. **13** (lines 28–29): καὶ ἄν τι ἀντιλ[έγηται πρὸς τὴν| c]υνθήκην, ἐπιχριθῆναι ἐν τῆι ἐκκλήτωι ⟨ἐν⟩ ἐξαμήνωι.

going to the Asklepieion, the temple of Poseidon in Kalaureia, and the Athena temple on the Athenian acropolis.

139. Lamia arbitrates a dispute between Doris and Sparta over the hieromnemonic vote (161/0)

An inscription found at Delphi. H: 0.296 m; w (max.): 0.39 m; d (max.): 0.265 m.

T. Walek/H. Pomtow, *GGA* 1913, p. 177; Dittenberger/Pomtow, *SIG*^{3} 668; *Daux, *Delphes*, p. 679.

Pomtow, *Klio* 18 (1923) p. 265, no. VIII; Daux, *Delphes*, pp. 329–35; R. Flacelière, *REA* 42 (1940) pp. 142–56; Ténékidès, p. 586; Daux, *BCH* 81 (1957) pp. 95–120; H. Kramolisch, *Die Strategen des thessalischen Bundes* (Bonn, 1978) pp. 57–58; *SEG* XXVIII.505; Cartledge/Spawforth, *Sparta*, p. 87.

Κ υ τ ι [ν ι έ ω ν]
[c]τραταγέοντος τῶν Θεσσαλ[ῶν Δαμοθοίνου - - - - -c. 20 - - - - -, ἐν δὲ]
Λαμίαι ταγευόντων Τίμωνος, Αἰ[- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -, μηνὸς]
ὡς Λαμιεῖς ἄγοντι Βωμίου, ἐν ὧι ἁ [κρίσις ἐγένετο ἅδε· πρεσβευτᾶν παρα-
γενη]-
θέντων ἐγ Λακεδαίμονος Ἀριστοκλέο[ς τοῦ - - -, - - - τοῦ - - -, καὶ παρὰ]
Δωριέων Πολυχάρμου τοῦ Πρασίδα, Ἀλκίφρ[ονος τοῦ - - - Κυτινιέων? - - - -]
κρινομένων περὶ τᾶς ψάφου τᾶς ἀμφικτιον[ικᾶς - - - - Δωριεῖς μὲν - - - - -]
ἰδίαν ὑπάρχειν, Λακεδαιμόνιοι δὲ κατὰ τὸ ἥμ[ισυ - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
τῶν Λαμιέων, ὄντες τριάκοντα καὶ εἷς, καθ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
διακρῖναι Λακεδαιμονίοις καὶ Δωριέοις τὸ - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
τερων καὶ ἐν τὰ παρακείμενα δίκαια ἐμΙ[- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
λιος εἶμεν. δωριαρχέοντος Εὐβιότου το[ῦ - - c. 15 - -, ἐν Δελφοῖς ἄρχοντος
Ἀνδρονίκου]
τοῦ Φρικίδα, βουλευόντων τὰν δευτέ[ραν ἐξάμηνον Ἄρχωνος τοῦ Καλλία,
Νικομάχου τοῦ Δεξίππου,]
γραμματεύοντος Ἀθάμβου τοῦ Ἀβρομ[άχου.]

2: [Δαμοθοίνου τοῦ Λεοντομένους Φεραίου]: Kramolisch. [μηνὸς Ἰτωνίου]: *GGA*, *SIG*^{3}. || 3: [- - προστατεύοντος - -]: *GGA*, *SIG*^{3}. || 4–5: ἐν ὡραί[αι ἐκκλησίαι, ἅδε κρίσις ἐγένετο· ἐπεὶ πρεσβευτᾶν πεμφ]|θέντων: *SIG*^{3}. ἐνωραί[ου? - - ἐπειδὴ πρέσβεων αἱρε]|θέντων: *GGA*. || 5: [παρὰ δὲ]: *GGA*, *SIG*^{3}. || 6: [Κυτινιέων, καὶ]: *GGA*, *SIG*^{3}. || 7: Ἀμφικτιον[ικᾶς τῶν Δωριέων]: *SIG*^{3}. || 7–8: [Δωριεῖς μὲν ἀξίωσαν ἑαυτοῖς τὰν ψᾶφον]| ἰδίαν ὑπάρχειν: *GGA*, *SIG*^{3}. || 8–9: ἥμ[ισυ μετέχειν ὡς πρότερον. οἱ κριταὶ οἱ αἱρεθέντες ὑπὸ]| τῶν Λαμιέων: *GGA*, *SIG*^{3}. || 9: καθ[ήμενοι χρόνον πλείονα]: *SIG*^{3}. [χρόνον πολύν]: *GGA*. || 9–10: [ὥστε]| διακρῖναι: *GGA*, *SIG*^{3}. || 10: τὸ [νεῖκος?]: *GGA*, *SIG*^{3}. || 10–11: [ἐπιτρεψάντων ἀμφο]|τέρων: *GGA*, *SIG*^{3}. || 11–12: δίκαια ἐμ[φανισάντων,

going to the Asklepieion, the temple of Poseidon in Kalaureia, and the Athena temple on the Athenian acropolis.

139. Lamia arbitrates a dispute between Doris and Sparta over the hieromnemonic vote (161/0)

An inscription found at Delphi. H: 0.296 m; w (max.): 0.39 m; d (max.): 0.265 m.

T. Walek/H. Pomtow, *GGA* 1913, p. 177; Dittenberger/Pomtow, *SIG*^{3} 668; *Daux, *Delphes*, p. 679.

Pomtow, *Klio* 18 (1923) p. 265, no. VIII; Daux, *Delphes*, pp. 329–35; R. Flacelière, *REA* 42 (1940) pp. 142–56; Ténékidès, p. 586; Daux, *BCH* 81 (1957) pp. 95–120; H. Kramolisch, *Die Strategen des thessalischen Bundes* (Bonn, 1978) pp. 57–58; *SEG* XXVIII.505; Cartledge/Spawforth, *Sparta*, p. 87.

Κ υ τ ι [ν ι έ ω ν]
[c]τραταγέοντος τῶν Θεσσαλ[ῶν Δαμοθοίνου - - - - -c. 20 - - - - -, ἐν δὲ]
Λαμίαι ταγευόντων Τίμωνος, Αἰ[- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -, μηνὸς]
ὡς Λαμιεῖς ἄγοντι Βωμίου, ἐν ὧι ἁ [κρίσις ἐγένετο ἅδε· πρεσβευτᾶν παρα-
γενη]-
θέντων ἐγ Λακεδαίμονος Ἀριστοκλέο[ς τοῦ - - -, - - - τοῦ - - -, καὶ παρὰ]
Δωριέων Πολυχάρμου τοῦ Πρασίδα, Ἀλκίφρ[ονος τοῦ - - - Κυτινιέων? - - - -]
κρινομένων περὶ τᾶς ψάφου τᾶς ἀμφικτιον[ικᾶς - - - - Δωριεῖς μὲν - - - - -]
ἰδίαν ὑπάρχειν, Λακεδαιμόνιοι δὲ κατὰ τὸ ἥμ[ισυ - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
τῶν Λαμιέων, ὄντες τριάκοντα καὶ εἷς, καθ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
διακρῖναι Λακεδαιμονίοις καὶ Δωριέοις τὸ - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
τερων καὶ ἐν τὰ παρακείμενα δίκαια ἐμΙ[- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
λιος εἶμεν. δωριαρχέοντος Εὐβιότου το[ῦ - - c. 15 - -, ἐν Δελφοῖς ἄρχοντος
Ἀνδρονίκου]
τοῦ Φρικίδα, βουλευόντων τὰν δευτέ[ραν ἐξάμηνον Ἄρχωνος τοῦ Καλλία,
Νικομάχου τοῦ Δεξίππου,]
γραμματεύοντος Ἀθάμβου τοῦ Ἀβρομ[άχου.]

2: [Δαμοθοίνου τοῦ Λεοντομένους Φεραίου]: Kramolisch. [μηνὸς Ἰτωνίου]: *GGA*, *SIG*^{3}. || 3: [- - προστατεύοντος - -]: *GGA*, *SIG*^{3}. || 4–5: ἐν ὡραί[αι ἐκκλησίαι, ἅδε κρίσις ἐγένετο· ἐπεὶ πρεσβευτᾶν πεμφ]|θέντων: *SIG*^{3}. ἐνωραί[ου? - - ἐπειδὴ πρέσβεων αἱρε]|θέντων: *GGA*. || 5: [παρὰ δὲ]: *GGA*, *SIG*^{3}. || 6: [Κυτινιέων, καὶ]: *GGA*, *SIG*^{3}. || 7: Ἀμφικτιον[ικᾶς τῶν Δωριέων]: *SIG*^{3}. || 7–8: [Δωριεῖς μὲν ἀξίωσαν ἑαυτοῖς τὰν ψᾶφον]| ἰδίαν ὑπάρχειν: *GGA*, *SIG*^{3}. || 8–9: ἥμ[ισυ μετέχειν ὡς πρότερον. οἱ κριταὶ οἱ αἱρεθέντες ὑπὸ]| τῶν Λαμιέων: *GGA*, *SIG*^{3}. || 9: καθ[ήμενοι χρόνον πλείονα]: *SIG*^{3}. [χρόνον πολύν]: *GGA*. || 9–10: [ὥστε]| διακρῖναι: *GGA*, *SIG*^{3}. || 10: τὸ [νεῖκος?]: *GGA*, *SIG*^{3}. || 10–11: [ἐπιτρεψάντων ἀμφο]|τέρων: *GGA*, *SIG*^{3}. || 11–12: δίκαια ἐμ[φανισάντων,

ἔκριναν, τὰν ψᾶφον πᾶσαν (or ἰδίαν) τᾶς Κυτινιέων (or ματρο-)πό]|λιος εἶμεν: *GGA*, *SIG*[3].

In the year 160 Sparta and the Dorians of Kytinion were rivals for the right of Amphiktyonic representation.[1] It seems that the Spartans and the central Greek Dorians had at some point shared this right, and this text tells us that the Spartans claimed half of the Dorian representation, which the Dorians were trying to keep to themselves. The issue went before a panel of thirty-one judges from Lamia. The fact that it was the city of Kytinion that was responsible for commissioning the Delphic inscription implies that the Lamian judges decided the matter in favour of the central Greek Dorians. This does not necessarily mean that the Spartans were altogether excluded from hieromnemonic representation; they may have been awarded a proportion less than the half they had requested.[2]

140. Rome supports a Delian-Achaian claim against Athens (159/8)

Polybios 32.7.1–5.

De Ruggiero, chap. 12, no. 6; Hitzig 14; Ferguson, *Athens*, pp. 323f.; Phillipson, p. 157; Raeder 55; Larsen (Frank), p. 280; Larsen, *GFS*, p. 486; Gauthier, p. 173; E. S. Gruen, *JHS* 96 (1976) p. 51; Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 3, pp. 525f.; Gruen, pp. 106–7; Bastini, p. 187.

Ὅτι παρὰ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἦκον πρέσβεις ... καὶ παρὰ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν οἱ περὶ Θεαρίδαν καὶ Στέφανον ὑπὲρ τῶν Δηλίων. (2) τοῖς γὰρ Δηλίοις δοθείσης ἀποκρίσεως παρὰ Ῥωμαίων, μετὰ τὸ συγχωρηθῆναι τὴν Δῆλον τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις, αὐτοῖς μὲν ἐκχωρεῖν ἐκ τῆς νήσου, (3) τὰ δ' ὑπάρχοντα κομίζεσθαι, μεταστάντες εἰς Ἀχαΐαν οἱ Δήλιοι καὶ πολιτογραφηθέντες ἐβούλοντο τὸ δίκαιον ἐκλαβεῖν παρὰ τῶν Ἀθηναίων κατὰ τὸ πρὸς τοὺς Ἀχαιοὺς σύμβολον. (4) τῶν δ' Ἀθηναίων φασκόντων μηδὲν εἶναι πρὸς αὐτοὺς τῆς δικαιοδοσίας ταύτης, ᾐτοῦντο ῥύσια τοὺς Ἀχαιοὺς οἱ Δήλιοι κατὰ τῶν Ἀθηναίων. (5) ὑπὲρ ὧν τότε πρεσβεύσαντες ἔλαβον ἀπόκριειν κυρίας εἶναι τὰς κατὰ τοὺς νόμους γεγενημένας παρὰ τοῖς Ἀχαιοῖς οἰκονομίας περὶ τῶν Δηλίων.

When Athens expelled the inhabitants of Delos in 167/6, the exiled Delians turned to the Achaian League for help and were welcomed in as new Achaian citizens. The Delians were thereupon eager to exploit their new connection with the Achaian League. They claimed the right to prosecute Athenians, no doubt on various charges arising from the subjugation and evacuation of their

1. Cf. **166** and **167**.

2. See Daux, *Delphes*, p. 335. For the (highly debated) history of the Amphiktyonic link between Sparta and Doris, see Pomtow; Ténékidès; Daux, *Delphes*; Flacelière, *REA* 42.

ἔκριναν, τὰν ψᾶφον πᾶσαν (or ἰδίαν) τᾶς Κυτινιέων (or ματρο-)πό]|λιος εἶμεν: *GGA*, *SIG*[3].

In the year 160 Sparta and the Dorians of Kytinion were rivals for the right of Amphiktyonic representation.[1] It seems that the Spartans and the central Greek Dorians had at some point shared this right, and this text tells us that the Spartans claimed half of the Dorian representation, which the Dorians were trying to keep to themselves. The issue went before a panel of thirty-one judges from Lamia. The fact that it was the city of Kytinion that was responsible for commissioning the Delphic inscription implies that the Lamian judges decided the matter in favour of the central Greek Dorians. This does not necessarily mean that the Spartans were altogether excluded from hieromnemonic representation; they may have been awarded a proportion less than the half they had requested.[2]

140. Rome supports a Delian-Achaian claim against Athens (159/8)

Polybios 32.7.1–5.

De Ruggiero, chap. 12, no. 6; Hitzig 14; Ferguson, *Athens*, pp. 323f.; Phillipson, p. 157; Raeder 55; Larsen (Frank), p. 280; Larsen, *GFS*, p. 486; Gauthier, p. 173; E. S. Gruen, *JHS* 96 (1976) p. 51; Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 3, pp. 525f.; Gruen, pp. 106–7; Bastini, p. 187.

Ὅτι παρὰ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἦκον πρέσβεις ... καὶ παρὰ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν οἱ περὶ Θεαρίδαν καὶ Στέφανον ὑπὲρ τῶν Δηλίων. (2) τοῖς γὰρ Δηλίοις δοθείσης ἀποκρίσεως παρὰ Ῥωμαίων, μετὰ τὸ συγχωρηθῆναι τὴν Δῆλον τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις, αὐτοῖς μὲν ἐκχωρεῖν ἐκ τῆς νήσου, (3) τὰ δ' ὑπάρχοντα κομίζεσθαι, μεταστάντες εἰς Ἀχαΐαν οἱ Δήλιοι καὶ πολιτογραφηθέντες ἐβούλοντο τὸ δίκαιον ἐκλαβεῖν παρὰ τῶν Ἀθηναίων κατὰ τὸ πρὸς τοὺς Ἀχαιοὺς σύμβολον. (4) τῶν δ' Ἀθηναίων φασκόντων μηδὲν εἶναι πρὸς αὐτοὺς τῆς δικαιοδοσίας ταύτης, ᾐτοῦντο ῥύσια τοὺς Ἀχαιοὺς οἱ Δήλιοι κατὰ τῶν Ἀθηναίων. (5) ὑπὲρ ὧν τότε πρεσβεύσαντες ἔλαβον ἀπόκριειν κυρίας εἶναι τὰς κατὰ τοὺς νόμους γεγενημένας παρὰ τοῖς Ἀχαιοῖς οἰκονομίας περὶ τῶν Δηλίων.

When Athens expelled the inhabitants of Delos in 167/6, the exiled Delians turned to the Achaian League for help and were welcomed in as new Achaian citizens. The Delians were thereupon eager to exploit their new connection with the Achaian League. They claimed the right to prosecute Athenians, no doubt on various charges arising from the subjugation and evacuation of their

1. Cf. **166** and **167**.

2. See Daux, *Delphes*, p. 335. For the (highly debated) history of the Amphiktyonic link between Sparta and Doris, see Pomtow; Ténékidès; Daux, *Delphes*; Flacelière, *REA* 42.

island, in accordance with the cύμβολον that the Athenians and the Achaians shared. This treaty between Athens and Achaia would have governed the procedure to be taken in private suits between Athenian and Achaian citizens.[1] The Athenians naturally refused to consider the Delian exiles as legitimate participants in the Athenian treaty with Achaia; as a result, the Delians pressured the Achaians to authorize them to carry out official reprisals and seizure of Athenian goods.[2] The Achaians apparently sanctioned the Delian ῥύcια, and this situation may have continued for a long time.[3] Finally in 159/8 both sides sent embassies to request the Roman senate to arbitrate the issue. The Roman answer, perhaps surprising when it is considered that they had earlier given the Athenians carte blanche in dealing with Delos, was that the Delian claim was to be upheld. They were to have the right to be included in the Achaian-Athenian cύμβολον.

141. Rome and Sikyon arbitrate between Athens and Oropos (156–155)

Pausanias 7.11.4–5.

M. H. E. Meier, *Die Privatschiedsrichter und die öffentlichen Diäteten Athens* (Halle, 1846) p. 35; Sonne 50; de Ruggiero, chap. 12, no. 7; Ferguson, *Athens*, pp. 324f.; Phillipson, p. 146; Raeder 56; Hiller von Gaertringen, *SIG*^{3} 675; Larsen (Frank), pp. 289–90; Larsen, *GFS*, pp. 486f.; E. S. Gruen, *JHS* 96 (1976) pp. 51–53; Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 3, pp. 531–33; A. Griffin, *Sikyon* (Oxford, 1982) p. 87; Bastini, pp. 187f., 195.

Ὁ μὲν δὴ τὰ ἐντεταλμένα ἐποίει, Ἀθηναίων δὲ ὁ δῆμος ἀνάγκῃ πλέον ἢ ἑκουcίως διαρπάζουcιν Ὠρωπὸν ὑπήκοόν cφιcιν οὖcαν.... καταφεύγουcιν οὖν ἐπὶ τὴν Ῥωμαίων βουλὴν οἱ Ὠρώπιοι· καὶ δόξαντες παθεῖν οὐ δίκαια, ἐπεcτάλη Cικυωνίοις ὑπὸ τῆc βουλῆc ἐπιβάλλειν cφᾶc Ἀθηναίοιc ἐc Ὠρωπίουc ζημίαν κατὰ τῆc βλάβηc ἧc ἦρξαν τὴν ἀξίαν. (5) Cικυώνιοι μὲν οὖν οὐκ ἀφικομένοιc ἐc καιρὸν τῆc κρίcεωc Ἀθηναίοιc ζημίαν πενταcόcια τάλαντα ἐπιβάλλουcι, Ῥωμαίων δὲ ἡ βουλὴ δεηθεῖcιν Ἀθηναίοιc ἀφῆκι πλὴν ταλάντων ἑκατὸν τὴν ἄλλην ζημίαν· ἐξέτιcαν δὲ οὐδὲ ταῦτα οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι.

The town of Oropos, on the border between Boiotia and Attika, was a constant source of contention between Athens and the Boiotians.[1] In 157

1. See Gauthier, p. 173, no. XXI.

2. The Athenians had refused δικαιοδοcία. See Gauthier, p. 173, on the official nature of ῥυciάζειν. Cf. **138**.

3. See Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 3, pp. 444, 526; Ferguson, pp. 323–24.

1. Cf. Piccirilli 45 (366 B.C.).

island, in accordance with the cύμβολον that the Athenians and the Achaians shared. This treaty between Athens and Achaia would have governed the procedure to be taken in private suits between Athenian and Achaian citizens.[1] The Athenians naturally refused to consider the Delian exiles as legitimate participants in the Athenian treaty with Achaia; as a result, the Delians pressured the Achaians to authorize them to carry out official reprisals and seizure of Athenian goods.[2] The Achaians apparently sanctioned the Delian ῥύcια, and this situation may have continued for a long time.[3] Finally in 159/8 both sides sent embassies to request the Roman senate to arbitrate the issue. The Roman answer, perhaps surprising when it is considered that they had earlier given the Athenians carte blanche in dealing with Delos, was that the Delian claim was to be upheld. They were to have the right to be included in the Achaian-Athenian cύμβολον.

141. Rome and Sikyon arbitrate between Athens and Oropos (156–155)

Pausanias 7.11.4–5.

M. H. E. Meier, *Die Privatschiedsrichter und die öffentlichen Diäteten Athens* (Halle, 1846) p. 35; Sonne 50; de Ruggiero, chap. 12, no. 7; Ferguson, *Athens*, pp. 324f.; Phillipson, p. 146; Raeder 56; Hiller von Gaertringen, *SIG*^{3} 675; Larsen (Frank), pp. 289–90; Larsen, *GFS*, pp. 486f.; E. S. Gruen, *JHS* 96 (1976) pp. 51–53; Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 3, pp. 531–33; A. Griffin, *Sikyon* (Oxford, 1982) p. 87; Bastini, pp. 187f., 195.

Ὁ μὲν δὴ τὰ ἐντεταλμένα ἐποίει, Ἀθηναίων δὲ ὁ δῆμος ἀνάγκῃ πλέον ἢ ἑκουcίως διαρπάζουcιν Ὠρωπὸν ὑπήκοόν cφιcιν οὖcαν.... καταφεύγουcιν οὖν ἐπὶ τὴν Ῥωμαίων βουλὴν οἱ Ὠρώπιοι· καὶ δόξαντες παθεῖν οὐ δίκαια, ἐπεcτάλη Cικυωνίοις ὑπὸ τῆc βουλῆc ἐπιβάλλειν cφᾶc Ἀθηναίοιc ἐc Ὠρωπίουc ζημίαν κατὰ τῆc βλάβηc ἧc ἦρξαν τὴν ἀξίαν. (5) Cικυώνιοι μὲν οὖν οὐκ ἀφικομένοιc ἐc καιρὸν τῆc κρίcεωc Ἀθηναίοιc ζημίαν πενταcόcια τάλαντα ἐπιβάλλουcι, Ῥωμαίων δὲ ἡ βουλὴ δεηθεῖcιν Ἀθηναίοιc ἀφῆκι πλὴν ταλάντων ἑκατὸν τὴν ἄλλην ζημίαν· ἐξέτιcαν δὲ οὐδὲ ταῦτα οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι.

The town of Oropos, on the border between Boiotia and Attika, was a constant source of contention between Athens and the Boiotians.[1] In 157

1. See Gauthier, p. 173, no. XXI.

2. The Athenians had refused δικαιοδοcία. See Gauthier, p. 173, on the official nature of ῥυciάζειν. Cf. **138**.

3. See Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 3, pp. 444, 526; Ferguson, pp. 323–24.

1. Cf. Piccirilli 45 (366 B.C.).

Athens raided Oropos, claiming it as its own subject.[2] Clearly the inhabitants of Oropos considered things in a different light; they acted independently in sending an embassy to Rome in the fall of the same year. Rome responded to this request for arbitration in two stages. First the senate ruled that Athens had acted unjustly, thereby reserving the main judgement, that of guilt or innocence, for itself. The senate thereupon delegated the task of fixing the sentence to a third Greek state, Sikyon, an act in keeping with their common procedure. Rome clearly wished to ensure that the decision went against Athens.[3] Even so, the Romans were apparently interested more in making their point than in punishing Athens severely. Probably in the summer of 156, Sikyon sentenced the Athenians to a fine of 500 talents; the huge sum may reflect the fact that Athenian representatives had refused to appear for the sentencing. When Athens appealed the fine, the Romans commuted it to 100 talents. The Athenians, however, did not pay even this amount, and relations with Achaia, already strained, deteriorated further over the continuing unsettled issue of Oropos.[4]

142. Rome mediates between Attalos II and Prousias II (156–154)

I: Polybios 32.16.5.
II: Polybios 33.1.1–2.
III: Polybios 33.7.1–4.
IV: Polybios 33.12.2–5.
V: Polybios 33.13.4–5.
VI: Appian *Mithridatica* 3.
VII: An inscription from the temple of Athena at Pergamon, which is also relevant to this case. H: 0.555 m; w: 0.965 m; d: 0.21 m.

Fränkel, *IPergamon* 225; *IGRR* IV.287; *Dittenberger, *OGIS* 327.

C. Habicht, *Hermes* 84 (1956) pp. 101f.; McShane, pp. 188f.; Préaux, p. 275; Hansen[2], pp. 133f.; Hopp, pp. 74–79; Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 3, pp. 540f., 549, 555f.; Will, vol. 2, pp. 381f.; Gruen, pp. 111, 114; Sherwin-White, pp. 37–38, 45–46.

2. The chronology is based on that suggested by Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 3, p. 532. Cf. *SIG*[3] 675.

3. Cf. the contemporary judgements made by Rome against Athens in the matter of the Delian exiles (**140**) and the Delian Serapeion (*SIG*[3] 664).

4. Paus. 7.11.5–8. See Larsen, *GFS*, pp. 486–87; Gruen, *JHS* 96.

Athens raided Oropos, claiming it as its own subject.[2] Clearly the inhabitants of Oropos considered things in a different light; they acted independently in sending an embassy to Rome in the fall of the same year. Rome responded to this request for arbitration in two stages. First the senate ruled that Athens had acted unjustly, thereby reserving the main judgement, that of guilt or innocence, for itself. The senate thereupon delegated the task of fixing the sentence to a third Greek state, Sikyon, an act in keeping with their common procedure. Rome clearly wished to ensure that the decision went against Athens.[3] Even so, the Romans were apparently interested more in making their point than in punishing Athens severely. Probably in the summer of 156, Sikyon sentenced the Athenians to a fine of 500 talents; the huge sum may reflect the fact that Athenian representatives had refused to appear for the sentencing. When Athens appealed the fine, the Romans commuted it to 100 talents. The Athenians, however, did not pay even this amount, and relations with Achaia, already strained, deteriorated further over the continuing unsettled issue of Oropos.[4]

142. Rome mediates between Attalos II and Prousias II (156–154)

I: Polybios 32.16.5.
II: Polybios 33.1.1–2.
III: Polybios 33.7.1–4.
IV: Polybios 33.12.2–5.
V: Polybios 33.13.4–5.
VI: Appian *Mithridatica* 3.
VII: An inscription from the temple of Athena at Pergamon, which is also relevant to this case. H: 0.555 m; w: 0.965 m; d: 0.21 m.

Fränkel, *IPergamon* 225; *IGRR* IV.287; *Dittenberger, *OGIS* 327.

C. Habicht, *Hermes* 84 (1956) pp. 101f.; McShane, pp. 188f.; Préaux, p. 275; Hansen[2], pp. 133f.; Hopp, pp. 74–79; Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 3, pp. 540f., 549, 555f.; Will, vol. 2, pp. 381f.; Gruen, pp. 111, 114; Sherwin-White, pp. 37–38, 45–46.

2. The chronology is based on that suggested by Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 3, p. 532. Cf. *SIG*[3] 675.

3. Cf. the contemporary judgements made by Rome against Athens in the matter of the Delian exiles (**140**) and the Delian Serapeion (*SIG*[3] 664).

4. Paus. 7.11.5–8. See Larsen, *GFS*, pp. 486–87; Gruen, *JHS* 96.

I: Polybios 32.16.5

Ἀμφιδοξήσαςα περὶ τῶν προσπιπτόντων ἡ σύγκλητος ἐξαπέστειλε πρεσβευτὰς Λεύκιον Ἀπολήιον καὶ Γάιον Πετρώνιον τοὺς ἐπισκεψομένους πῶς ἔχει τὰ κατὰ τοὺς προειρημένους βασιλεῖς.

II: Polybios 33.1.1–2

Ὅτι ἡ σύγκλητος ἔτι κατὰ χειμῶνα διακόυσαςα τῶν περὶ τὸν Πόπλιον Λέντλον ὑπὲρ τῶν κατὰ Προυσίαν διὰ τὸ νεωστὶ παραγεγονέναι τούτους ἐκ τῆς Ἀσίας, εἰσεκαλέσατο καὶ τὸν Ἀθήναιον τὸν Ἀττάλου τοῦ βασιλέως ἀδελφόν. (2) οὐ μέντοι πολλῶν προσεδεήθη λόγων, ἀλλ' εὐθέως καταστήσαςα πρεσβευτὰς συνεξαπέστελλε τῷ προειρημένῳ τοὺς περὶ Γάιον Κλαύδιον Κέντωνα καὶ Λεύκιον Ὀρτήσιον καὶ Γάιον Αὐρογκολήιον, ἐντολὰς δοῦσα κωλύειν τὸν Προυσίαν Ἀττάλῳ πολεμεῖν.

III: Polybios 33.7.1–4

Ὅτι τῶν περὶ τὸν Ὀρτήσιον καὶ Αὐρογκολήιον παραγεγονότων ἐκ τοῦ Περγάμου καὶ διασαφούντων τήν τε τοῦ Προυσίου καταφρόνησιν τῶν τῆς συγκλήτου παραγγελμάτων, (2) καὶ διότι παρασπονδήσας καὶ συγκλείσας εἰς τὸ Πέργαμον αὐτούς τε καὶ τοὺς περὶ τὸν Ἄτταλον πᾶσαν βίαν ἐνεδείξατο καὶ παρανομίαν, (3) ἡ σύγκλητος ὀργισθεῖσα καὶ βαρέως φέρουσα τὸ γεγονὸς ἐξ αὐτῆς δέκα πρεσβευτὰς κατέστησε τοὺς περὶ Λεύκιον Ἀνίκιον καὶ Γάιον Φάννιον καὶ Κόιντον Φάβιον Μάξιμον, (4) καὶ παραχρῆμ' ἐξαπέστειλεν, ἐντολὰς αὐτοῖς δοῦσα διαλῦσαι τὸν πόλεμον καὶ τὸν Προυσίαν ἀναγκάσαι δίκας ὑποσχεῖν Ἀττάλῳ τῶν κατὰ πόλεμον ἀδικημάτων.

IV: Polybios 33.12.2–5

Ἦκον ἐκ τῆς Ῥώμης οἱ δέκα πρέσβεις, οἳ καὶ συμμίξαντες αὐτῷ περὶ Κάδους καὶ κοινολογηθέντες περὶ τῶν πραγμάτων ὥρμησαν πρὸς τὸν Προυσίαν. (3) ἐπειδὴ δὲ συνέμιξαν, διεσάφουν αὐτῷ τὰ παρὰ τῆς συγκλήτου μετὰ πολλῆς ἀνατάσεως. (4) ὁ δὲ Προυσίας ἔνια μὲν τῶν προσταττομένων προσεδέχετο, τοῖς δὲ πλείστοις ἀντέλεγε. (5) διόπερ οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι προσκόψαντες αὐτῷ τήν τε φιλίαν ἀπείπαντο καὶ τὴν συμμαχίαν, καὶ πάντες ἐξ αὐτῆς ἀπηλλάττοντο πάλιν ὡς τὸν Ἄτταλον.

V: Polybios 33.13.4–5

Ἡ δὲ σύγκλητος διακούσαςα τῶν παρὰ τοῦ Προυσίου πρεσβευτῶν ἀναχεχωρηκότων ἐξ αὐτῆς τρεῖς ἄλλους ἀπέστειλεν, Ἄππιόν τε τὸν Κλαύδιον καὶ Λεύκιον Ὄππιον καὶ Αὖλον Ποστόμιον. (5) οἳ καὶ παραγενόμενοι πρὸς τὴν Ἀσίαν διέλυσαν τὸν πόλεμον, εἰς τὰς τοιαύτας συνθήκας ἐπαγαγόμενοι τοὺς βασιλέας ἀμφοτέρους ...

VI: Appian *Mithridatica* 3

Χρόνῳ δ' ὕστερον Ἀττάλῳ τι χαλεπήνας, τῷ βασιλεῖ τῆς Ἀσίας τῆς περὶ τὸ Πέργαμον, τὴν γῆν ἐδῄου τὴν Ἀσιάδα. μαθοῦσα δ' ἡ Ῥωμαίων βουλὴ προσέπεμπε τῷ Προυσίᾳ μή πολεμεῖν Ἀττάλῳ, φίλῳ Ῥωμαίων ὄντι καὶ συμμάχῳ. καὶ δυσπειθῶς ἔτι ἔχοντι οἱ πρέσβεις μετ' ἀνατάσεως προσέταξον πείθεσθαι τοῖς ὑπὸ τῆς συγκλήτου λεγομένοις, καὶ ἥκειν μετὰ χιλίων ἱππέων ἔς τι μεθόριον ἐπὶ συνθήκαις, ἔνθα καὶ τὸν Ἄτταλον ἔφασαν περιμένειν μετὰ τοσῶνδε ἑτέρων. ὁ δ' ὡς ὀλίγων τῶν σὺν Ἀττάλῳ καταφρονήσας, καὶ ἐλπίσας αὐτὸν ἐνεδρεύσειν, προύπεμπε τοὺς πρέσβεις ὡς μετὰ χιλίων ἑπόμενος, πάντα δ' ἀναστήσας τὸν στρατὸν ἦγεν ὡς ἐς μάχην. Ἀττάλου δὲ καὶ τῶν πρέσβεων αἰσθομένων τε καὶ διαφυγόντων ᾗ δυνατὸς αὐτῶν ἐγίγνετο ἕκαστος, ὁ δὲ καὶ τῶν σκευοφόρων τῶν Ῥωμαϊκῶν ὑπολειφθέντων ἥπτετο, καὶ χωρίον τι Νικηφόριον ἐξελὼν κατέσκαπτε, καὶ τοὺς ἐν αὐτῷ νεὼς ἐνεπίμπρη, Ἄτταλόν τε ἐς τὸ Πέργαμον συμφυγόντα ἐπολιόρκει, μέχρι καὶ τῶνδε οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι πυθόμενοι πρέσβεις ἑτέρους ἔπεμπον, οἳ τὸν Προυσίαν ἐκέλευον Ἀττάλῳ τὰς βλάβας ἀποτῖσαι. τότε οὖν καταπλαγεὶς ὁ Προυσίας ὑπήκουσε καὶ ἀνεχώρει.

VII: The Pergamon inscription

Βα[c]ιλεὺς Ἄτταλος βας[ιλέως Ἀττάλου]
καὶ [o]ἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ στρατεύσα[ντες ἐπὶ Προυσίαν]
καὶ πολιορκήσαντες αὐτὸ[ν ἐν Νικομηδείαι]
παραβάντα τὰς διὰ Ῥωμαίωγ γε[νομένας συνθήκας,]
Διὶ καὶ Ἀθηνᾶι Νικηφόρω[ι ἀντὶ τῶν διὰ]
τῆς τοῦ πολέμου συντελείας ἐπ[ιτευγμάτων.]

2: [πρὸς Προυσίαν]: Fränkel. || 5: [χαριστήριον]: Fränkel. || 6: ἐπ[ικρατήσαντες]: Fränkel.

The hostilities of 156 between Bithynia and Pergamon, and appeals to Rome from both sides, prompted the Roman senate to send out legates in order to investigate the matter. Rome was the ally of both kings and more and more had taken up the role of mediator of affairs in the East. It naturally became involved in most disputes, whether through its own interests in maintaining a balance of power or through the appeals of the disputants. It was on hearing the Pergamene embassy of Athenaios and the Roman ambassador Lentulus in the spring of 155 that the senate recognized that Prousias was the aggressor. The senate sent more legates, this time with instructions to put a stop to Prousias's war on Attalos. These legates called on Prousias to agree to negotiations with Attalos and attempted to mediate a meeting between the two kings. This attempt failed when Prousias attacked and laid siege to Attalos and the Roman ambassadors in Pergamon over the summer of 155. It was no doubt this insult offered to the Roman ambassadors and implicitly to Rome itself, and to Rome's status as mediator among the Asian kingdoms, that dictated the senate's next move. This time a decemvirate was dispatched, with orders not only to put an end to the war

but to compel Prousias to compensate Attalos for the injuries he had inflicted upon him.[1] The Roman legation arrived in the spring of 154, and their attempts to force Prousias to come to terms with Attalos initially failed. Prousias agreed to some, but not all, of their demands.

Still, the Romans were determined to have Prousias agree to negotiations to end this Eastern war; their approach was more vigorous than it had been at times in the past.[2] After the failure of the first few legations, the tone adopted by the decemvirate was apparently not as diplomatic as might be expected of mediators. When Prousias refused their first demands, the Roman legates renounced the Roman alliance with him and did everything possible, short of declaring a Roman war on Prousias, to favour the cause of Attalos. There is a gap in Polybios's account at this stage, but it is still clear that Prousias's first reaction to Roman hostility was one of fear.[3] Although Rome had not in fact threatened war, the tone of the demand that Prousias make peace with Attalos was close to that of an ultimatum. Prousias evidently decided that retention of Roman friendship was worth more to him than victory over Attalos. When yet another legation arrived, they had apparently little difficulty in mediating a treaty between the two kings. It is this treaty that is mentioned in the inscription from Pergamon (line 4).

143. Priene appeals to Rome for intervention with Ariarathes (c. 155/4)

I: Two fragments of an inscription from the temple of Athena at Priene. A: h. 0.5 m; w: 0.33 m. B (now lost): h: 0.5 m.

Viereck 28 (A); Hicks, *BMus* 424; Dittenberger, *OGIS* 351; Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene* 39; *Sherk 6.

II: Polybios 33.6.1–2 and 6–9.
III: Diodoros 31.32.

Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene* T 538; Magie, *Buckler Studies,* pp. 180–81; id., *RRAM*, vol. 1, pp. 117, 202; vol. 2, pp. 969, 1097; H. H. Scullard, *Roman Politics,* 220–150 B.C. (Oxford, 1951) pp. 232–36; Johnson et al., *ARS* 36a; McShane, pp. 187–88; Hansen[2], pp. 130–31; Hopp, pp. 65–67; Sherwin-White, *JRS* 67

1. See Walbank, *Comm,* vol. 3, p. 549: "The sending of *decemviri* indicates the serious view taken of Prusias's intransigence."

2. Cf. **123**, **134**.

3. There is a gap in the narrative of events between 33.12.9 and 13.1; see Walbank, *Comm,* vol. 3, p. 556.

but to compel Prousias to compensate Attalos for the injuries he had inflicted upon him.[1] The Roman legation arrived in the spring of 154, and their attempts to force Prousias to come to terms with Attalos initially failed. Prousias agreed to some, but not all, of their demands.

Still, the Romans were determined to have Prousias agree to negotiations to end this Eastern war; their approach was more vigorous than it had been at times in the past.[2] After the failure of the first few legations, the tone adopted by the decemvirate was apparently not as diplomatic as might be expected of mediators. When Prousias refused their first demands, the Roman legates renounced the Roman alliance with him and did everything possible, short of declaring a Roman war on Prousias, to favour the cause of Attalos. There is a gap in Polybios's account at this stage, but it is still clear that Prousias's first reaction to Roman hostility was one of fear.[3] Although Rome had not in fact threatened war, the tone of the demand that Prousias make peace with Attalos was close to that of an ultimatum. Prousias evidently decided that retention of Roman friendship was worth more to him than victory over Attalos. When yet another legation arrived, they had apparently little difficulty in mediating a treaty between the two kings. It is this treaty that is mentioned in the inscription from Pergamon (line 4).

143. Priene appeals to Rome for intervention with Ariarathes (c. 155/4)

I: Two fragments of an inscription from the temple of Athena at Priene. A: h. 0.5 m; w: 0.33 m. B (now lost): h: 0.5 m.

Viereck 28 (A); Hicks, *BMus* 424; Dittenberger, *OGIS* 351; Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene* 39; *Sherk 6.

II: Polybios 33.6.1–2 and 6–9.
III: Diodoros 31.32.

Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene* T 538; Magie, *Buckler Studies,* pp. 180–81; id., *RRAM*, vol. 1, pp. 117, 202; vol. 2, pp. 969, 1097; H. H. Scullard, *Roman Politics,* 220–150 B.C. (Oxford, 1951) pp. 232–36; Johnson et al., *ARS* 36a; McShane, pp. 187–88; Hansen[2], pp. 130–31; Hopp, pp. 65–67; Sherwin-White, *JRS* 67

1. See Walbank, *Comm,* vol. 3, p. 549: "The sending of *decemviri* indicates the serious view taken of Prusias's intransigence."

2. Cf. **123**, **134**.

3. There is a gap in the narrative of events between 33.12.9 and 13.1; see Walbank, *Comm,* vol. 3, p. 556.

(1977) p. 63; Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 3, pp. 547–49; Will, vol. 2, pp. 372f.; Gruen, p. 114; Sherwin-White, pp. 41–42; Sherk, *TDGR* 32.

I: The inscription from Priene

A -
[- - - - τῶν] φίλων τοὺς ἀνανε[ωσαμένους - - - -]
- - - - - - ἐπεὶ γὰρ Ἀριαράθ[ης - - - - - - - -]
[- - - - οὐ]χ ἠδυνήθη διὰ τῶ[ν - - - - - - - -]
- - - - - - - χαὶ Ῥωμαίων τῶν - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - τῶν οἰομένων - - - - - - - - - - -
[- - - - ἐν τῶι ἱ]ερῶι· μετὰ δ[ὲ - - - - - - - -]
[- - - - - - - - - ἡ]μῖν ἀποκ[ρίνασθαι - - - - -]
- - - - - - - - - - πάλιν ἐξ- - - - - - - - - -
- -

2: [τὴν συμμαχίαν]: suggested by Hiller von Gaertringen. || 4–5: Hiller von Gaertringen suggests something along the lines of διὰ τῶ[ν ὅπλων κρατῆσαι τῶν χρημάτων, ἐμποδισθεὶς ὑπὸ - -| Ῥοδίων?] καὶ Ῥωμαίων τῶν - -. || 6: [προεστώ]των: Dittenberger. || 7f.: Hiller von Gaertringen suggests that the sense is μετὰ δ[ὲ ταῦτα πρεσβευτῶν ἐλθόντων παρὰ Πριηνέων - -|- - ἔδοξεν ἡ]μῖν ἀποκ[ρίνασθαι]. This interpretation presupposes that the document is a Roman letter, which is not certain; it could be a decree of Priene (cf. Dittenberger).

B [- - - - Ἀριαράθης τὴν Πριηνέων] πόλιν πολιο[ρκήσας]
[καὶ κ]τήμα[τ]α c[υλήσας, πλεῖστα] δὲ καὶ σώματα [ἰδιωτικά τε καὶ]
[δημό]σια ἀπ[αγαγὼν - - - - - - -] ἀφεὶς μὲ[ν - - - - - -]
. . θαι δ᾽ Ὀροφέρνης ἐν τῶι ἱερῶι τ[ῆ]c Ἀ[θηνᾶc παρακατέθετο, ἀποκρίνα]-
[cθαι] αὐτοῖc φιλανθρώπ[ωc· ἔδ]ο[ξε - - - - - - - οὔτε τῆς]
cυγκλήτου οὔτε τοῦ δήμου ἐπὶ θελπ- - - - - - - - - - - - - -
oc· περί τε τούτων τῶν πραγμάτω[ν οὕτως ἔδοξεν· τὸν δεῖνα πρὸς]
[β]ασιλέα Ἄτταλον καὶ βασιλέα Ἀρια[ράθην γράψαι περὶ τῆς ἐπι]-
[δ]ρομῆς οὕτω καθὼς ἂν αὐτῶι ἐ[κ τῶν δημοσίων πραγμάτων πίστεώς]
[τε τῆς ἰδίας φαίνηται· ἔδοξεν].

2: [πολλὰ]: Dittenberger. || 2–3: σώματα [καὶ| θρέμματα -]cια: Dittenberger. [θρέμμα|τα πολλαπλά]cια ἀπ[ολέcας]: Hicks.

II: Polybios 33.6.1–2 and 6–9

Ὅτι κατὰ τοὺς καιροὺς τούτους καὶ Πριηνεῖς ἐνέπεσόν παραλόγῳ συμφορᾷ. (2) δεξάμενοι γὰρ παρ᾽ Ὀροφέρνους, ὅτ᾽ ἐκράτησε τῆς ἀρχῆς, ἐν παραθήκῃ τετρακόσια τάλαντα ἀπῃτοῦντο κατὰ τοὺς ἑξῆς χρόνους ὑπ᾽ Ἀριαράθου, ὅτε μετέλαβε τὴν ἀρχήν.... (6) κατὰ δὲ τοὺς νῦν λεγομένους καιροὺς ἐπαποστείλας ἐλεηλάτει τὴν χώραν τῶν Πριηνέων, συνεργοῦντος Ἀττάλου καὶ παροξύνοντος αὐτὸν διὰ τὴν ἰδίαν διαφοράν, ἣν εἶχε πρὸς τοὺς Πριηνεῖς. (7) πολλῶν δὲ καὶ σωμάτων καὶ θρεμμάτων ἀπολομένων καὶ πρὸς τῇ πόλει πτωμάτων

γενομένων, ἀμύνασθαι μὲν οὐχ οἷοί τ' ἦσαν οἱ Πριηνεῖς, ἐπρέσβευον δὲ καὶ πρὸς Ῥοδίους, μετὰ δὲ ταῦτ' ἐπὶ Ῥωμαίους κατέφυγον. (8) οἱ δ' οὐ προσεῖχον τοῖς λεγομένοις.... (9) τῷ μὲν γὰρ Ὀροφέρνει τὴν παραθήκην ἀπέδωκαν, ὑπὸ δὲ τοῦ βασιλέως Ἀριαράθου ἱκαναῖς τισι βλάβαις περιέπεσον ἀδίκως διὰ τὴν παραθήκην.

III: Diodoros 31.32

[Ὁ Ὀροφέρνης] ἀθροίσας δὲ χρημάτων πλῆθος τετρακόσια τάλαντα παρέθετο Πριηνεῦσι πρὸς τὰ τῆς τύχης παράλογα· ἅπερ ὕστερον ἀπέδωκαν.

When Ariarathes V was reinstated as king of Cappadocia in 157, with the aid of Attalos II, he made war on his rebellious brother Orophernes. One of the communities caught in the middle of this strife was Priene, in whose Athena temple Orophernes had deposited 400 talents. Ariarathes now demanded the return of that money, and Priene was trapped between the two brothers. The Roman stance was of no real help, since the senate had recognized the legitimacy of both kings (App. *Syr.* 47). Priene decided to refuse to relinquish the money to Ariarathes, and the result was a war waged against Priene by Ariarathes and Attalos. Accordingly, the people of Priene appealed to Rhodes to settle the situation. It is not clear whether Priene wished for military assistance or not from Rhodes. Military assistance, with Rhodes caught up in the Second Cretan War, would have been problematic. But it seems possible that the Prienians wanted to enlist the Rhodians as mediators. However, Rhodes's heyday as an arbitrator was evidently past; we hear of no response to the Prienian embassy.[1]

Priene then turned to Rome. According to Polybios the Romans also ignored their plea. However, the fragmented inscription from Priene indicates that this was not the entire truth. The second document (I B), which is a decree of the senate, provides for the dispatch of a letter to Ariarathes and Attalos, requesting them to desist from their attacks on Priene. This was probably the extent of the Roman intervention in the affair. The Romans were forced to compromise, since Ariarathes and Attalos were their allies. Nevertheless, despite the fact that this has been called a weak and ineffectual response on the part of the Romans, it may well have achieved what it was set out to do. Priene clearly suffered, as Polybios pointed out; but it was also able to repay the deposit to Orophernes after having refused it to Ariarathes.

1. See Will, vol. 2, p. 383; Ager, *Historia* 40 (1991) p. 39.

144. Rome settles the Second Cretan War (153)

Polybios 33.15.3–4.

Van Effenterre, pp. 267–69; H. H. Schmitt, *Rom und Rhodos* (Munich, 1957) p. 177; P. Brulé, *La piraterie crétoise hellénistique* (Paris, 1978) pp. 61–63; Berthold, pp. 223–24.

> Καὶ Ἀστυμήδης ὁ Ῥόδιος, πρεσβευτὴς ἅμα καὶ ναύαρχος καθεσταμένος, παρελθὼν ἐξ αὐτῆς εἰς τὴν σύγκλητον διελέγετο πἐρὶ τοῦ πολέμου τοῦ πρὸς Κρηταιεῖς. (4) ἡ δὲ σύγκλητος προσέχουσα τὸν νοῦν ἐπιμελῶς παραχρῆμα πρεσβευτὰς ἐξαπέστειλε τοὺς περὶ Κόιντον λύσοντας τὸν πόλεμον.

In 155/4 the resurgence of Cretan piracy drew Rhodes into its second war with the islanders. Little is known of the conflict, but it is clear that it caused difficulties for Rhodes.[1] At one point the Rhodian navy was apparently defeated in a naval encounter with the pirates (Diod. 31.38). The Rhodians were also pressured by their commitment to aid the Attalid prince Athenaios against Prousias (Polyb. 33.11). Rhodes appealed to the Achaian League for military aid, but this request was blocked by a simultaneous embassy from Crete to the Achaians (Polyb. 33.16; Diod. 31.43). Antiphates, the Cretan envoy, successfully put a stop to any Achaian activity, and the ultimate Achaian decision was not to take any action without first ascertaining Rome's position. As a final resort, the Rhodian navarch Astymedes turned to Rome in the summer of 153 for a settlement. The Romans responded with vigour on this occasion, and the senate sent out a certain Quintus whose mandate was to put a stop to the Rhodian-Cretan conflict.[2] The piracy factor and considerations of maritime safety no doubt played an important part in the Roman decision.

145. Patrai arbitrates disputes between Megalopolis and Thouria (c. 150)

A stele, inscribed on both sides, found at Thouria. H: 1.12 m; w: 0.80 m; d: 0.14 m.

N. S. Valmin, *Bulletin de la Société royale des lettres, Lund*, 1928–29, pp. 108–23, no. 1; *SEG* XI.972 (after Valmin); *Moretti, *ISE* 51.

G. de Sanctis, *RFC* 57 (1929) p. 570; M. A. Levi, *RFC* 59 (1931) pp. 93–97; M. Guarducci, *RFC* 60 (1932) p. 85 n. 2; A. Aymard, *Les assemblées de la confédération*

1. See Berthold, p. 223.
2. Van Effenterre (p. 269) identifies him as Q. Fabius.

144. Rome settles the Second Cretan War (153)

Polybios 33.15.3–4.

Van Effenterre, pp. 267–69; H. H. Schmitt, *Rom und Rhodos* (Munich, 1957) p. 177; P. Brulé, *La piraterie crétoise hellénistique* (Paris, 1978) pp. 61–63; Berthold, pp. 223–24.

> Καὶ Ἀστυμήδης ὁ Ῥόδιος, πρεσβευτὴς ἅμα καὶ ναύαρχος καθεσταμένος, παρελθὼν ἐξ αὐτῆς εἰς τὴν σύγκλητον διελέγετο πἐρὶ τοῦ πολέμου τοῦ πρὸς Κρηταιεῖς. (4) ἡ δὲ σύγκλητος προσέχουσα τὸν νοῦν ἐπιμελῶς παραχρῆμα πρεσβευτὰς ἐξαπέστειλε τοὺς περὶ Κόιντον λύσοντας τὸν πόλεμον.

In 155/4 the resurgence of Cretan piracy drew Rhodes into its second war with the islanders. Little is known of the conflict, but it is clear that it caused difficulties for Rhodes.[1] At one point the Rhodian navy was apparently defeated in a naval encounter with the pirates (Diod. 31.38). The Rhodians were also pressured by their commitment to aid the Attalid prince Athenaios against Prousias (Polyb. 33.11). Rhodes appealed to the Achaian League for military aid, but this request was blocked by a simultaneous embassy from Crete to the Achaians (Polyb. 33.16; Diod. 31.43). Antiphates, the Cretan envoy, successfully put a stop to any Achaian activity, and the ultimate Achaian decision was not to take any action without first ascertaining Rome's position. As a final resort, the Rhodian navarch Astymedes turned to Rome in the summer of 153 for a settlement. The Romans responded with vigour on this occasion, and the senate sent out a certain Quintus whose mandate was to put a stop to the Rhodian-Cretan conflict.[2] The piracy factor and considerations of maritime safety no doubt played an important part in the Roman decision.

145. Patrai arbitrates disputes between Megalopolis and Thouria (c. 150)

A stele, inscribed on both sides, found at Thouria. H: 1.12 m; w: 0.80 m; d: 0.14 m.

N. S. Valmin, *Bulletin de la Société royale des lettres, Lund*, 1928–29, pp. 108–23, no. 1; *SEG* XI.972 (after Valmin); *Moretti, *ISE* 51.

G. de Sanctis, *RFC* 57 (1929) p. 570; M. A. Levi, *RFC* 59 (1931) pp. 93–97; M. Guarducci, *RFC* 60 (1932) p. 85 n. 2; A. Aymard, *Les assemblées de la confédération*

1. See Berthold, p. 223.
2. Van Effenterre (p. 269) identifies him as Q. Fabius.

achaienne (Paris, 1938) p. 175; Roebuck, Diss., pp. 103–4, 168; C. Roebuck, *CPh* 40 (1945) p. 165; S. Accame, *Il dominio romano* (Rome, 1946) pp. 142f.; Robert, *REG* 1966, 202; *SEG* XXIII.208, 215–17, XXIV.284, XXV.433.

'Επὶ ἱερέος τᾶς 'Αθάνας Δαμίωνος, γραμματέος τῶν cυνέδρων 'Αριστομένεος τοῦ 'Αριστίωνος. ψάφιcμα.
ἐμφανιζόντων τῶν cυνδίκων διότι ἀνθαιρέμεθα κριτήριον τὰν πόλιν τῶν Πατρέων ἐπὶ τὰc δίκας, ἃc ἔχει ἁ πόλιc ἁμῶν ποτὶ τὰν πόλιν
5 τῶν Μεγαλοπολιτᾶν, ὥcτε κριθῆμεν ἐν τοῖc cυνέδροις πάντοις τοῦ δωδεκάτου μηνὸc τᾶι δυοδεκάται,[v] ἔδοξε τοῖc cυνέδροις πορεύεcθαι εἰc Πάτραc ἐπὶ τὰc κρίcειc, ἂν ἐπιδέξωνται οἱ Πατρεῖc τὸ κρίμα, τούc τε cυνδίκουc καὶ τοὺc cυνέδρουc πάντας πλὰν τῶν τῆc Οὐπιcίαc καὶ τῶν ἐπικριθέντων·[v] πορευέcτωcαν δὲ καὶ τῶν
10 ἄλλων οἱ θέλοντεc·[v] τοὺc δὲ ἐλθόντας ἀναγραψάcθω ὁ γραμματεὺc τῶν cυνέδρων ἐμ Πάτραιc, καὶ ἂν νικά[v]cωμεc, ἀναγραψάτω ἐν τῶι ἱερῶι τᾶc Cυρίαc εἰc cτάλαν λιθίναν[v] τούc τε cυνδίκουc πάντας πατριcτί,[v] ὁμοίωc δὲ καὶ τοὺc ἐλθόντας ὑπογράψαc τὸν ἱερῆ τᾶc 'Αθάνας καὶ τὸ ψάφιcμα.
15 cύνδικοι·

[104 names follow, with space for 7 more now completely lost.]

53 [ἔδοξε· - - - - - - - -] Λ̣ακεδαιμ̣[ό]νιος
[ἐποί]ης[ε.]

9: ΟΥΠΙΣΙΑΣ: Valmin.

This inscription is a decree of the town of Thouria in Messenia, near the head of the Messenian Gulf. Thouria apparently had a number of disputes with Megalopolis; their nature is unclear from the inscription.[1] The plurality of suits might indicate that they were of a private nature and involved individual citizens of the two states (lines 4–5). But the fact that Thouria can speak of "winning," as though there was one major issue, and the fact that so many representatives and onlookers went to Patrai imply that the dispute was over some matter of national importance. Certainly the arbitration was to be on a public and international level, with the two states of Thouria and Megalopolis as the two disputants. The representatives (cύνδικοι) of both Megalopolis and Thouria met, perhaps on some neutral ground, in order to come to an arrangement for

1. Valmin and others after him dated this case to the same period as the boundary arbitration between Megalopolis, Messene, and Thouria of 182 and believed it to be connected (**116**); Roebuck, however, has conclusively shown that the rationale for connecting the two inscriptions is faulty (Diss., pp. 103–4 n. 168). This inscription is therefore tentatively dated to around the middle of the second century. If any part of the dispute between Thouria and Megalopolis had to do with their borders, it should predate 146. Rome's restoration of the Dentheliatis to Messene in 146 (**150**) would have ruled out any border contact, and therefore any border conflict between Thouria and Megalopolis (Accame, p. 142; see also Guarducci and Moretti).

dealing with their differences. The city chosen to arbitrate between the two states, both of whom were members of the Achaian League, was Patrai, one of its founding members.[2] Official League involvement is not explicit in this inscription; perhaps it was unnecessary for the League to be fully involved when its members turned to arbitration voluntarily.

This decree makes provisions for the conduct of the case; clearly it forms the intial agreement to go to arbitration, the *compromissum*. The officials and representatives of Thouria were to rendezvous at Patrai with those from Megalopolis. These plans were of course dependent on Patrai accepting the task of arbitration; should it do so, the judgement was to take place within a set period of time. If Thouria won its case, the names of all those who went to Patrai were to be inscribed on a stele in the temple of the Syrian goddess. The fact that the stele bears over a hundred names indicates that Thouria did indeed win its case.

146. Pergamene judges arbitrate between Mytilene and Pitane (between c. 150 and 133)

Numerous fragments of a large marble stele discovered at Pergamon. H: c. 2.0 m; w: 0.62 m (above)-0.675 m (below); d: 0.215 m (above)-0.23 m (below). Three main documents are recorded in the inscription:

I: a decree of Pitane and the beginning of a decree of Mytilene.
II: the continuation of the decree of Mytilene.
III: a decree of Pergamon.
IV: lines 158–61, whose placement is uncertain.

Fränkel, *IPergamon* 245; Berard 35; *Dittenberger, *OGIS* 335; Hiller von Gaertringen, *IG* XII supp., pp. 48–49, no. 142; Daverio Rocchi 18.1 (lines 111–17).

O. Hoffmann, *Die griechischen Dialekte* II (Göttingen, 1893) p. 69, no. 95; A. Wilhelm, *AEM* 20 (1897) p. 57; Raeder 46; Tod 59, pp. 142f.; Meyer, *Grenzen,* pp. 106–7; L. Robert, *BCH* 49 (1925) pp. 219–21; Steinwenter, pp. 177, 180, 183, 188; L. Robert, *BCH* 50 (1926) p. 469; *SEG* IV.680; de Taube, pp. 44–45; L. Robert, *REA* 34 (1932) p. 523; Heuss, p. 144; Magie, *Buckler Studies,* p. 183; Robert, *REG* 1939, 31; Magie, *RRAM*, vol. 1, p. 114; vol. 2, p. 965; K. M. T. Atkinson, *Antichthon* 2 (1968) pp. 53–54; L. Robert, *Études anatoliennes* (Amsterdam, 1970) pp. 114–15 n. 1; W. Orth, *Königlicher Machtanspruch und städtische Freiheit* (Munich, 1977) pp. 111f.; L. Robert, *BCH* 101 (1977) p. 128; *SEG* XXVII.807; A. Chaniotis, *Historie und Historiker in den griechischen Inschriften* (Stuttgart, 1988) pp. 114–15, 274, 357–58; I. Savalli-Lestrade, *REG* 105 (1992) pp. 221–30.

2. More than one choice might have been available, given that the representatives of Thouria are said to have "preferred" Patrai. Cf. the conjectures in **46**.

dealing with their differences. The city chosen to arbitrate between the two states, both of whom were members of the Achaian League, was Patrai, one of its founding members.[2] Official League involvement is not explicit in this inscription; perhaps it was unnecessary for the League to be fully involved when its members turned to arbitration voluntarily.

This decree makes provisions for the conduct of the case; clearly it forms the intial agreement to go to arbitration, the *compromissum*. The officials and representatives of Thouria were to rendezvous at Patrai with those from Megalopolis. These plans were of course dependent on Patrai accepting the task of arbitration; should it do so, the judgement was to take place within a set period of time. If Thouria won its case, the names of all those who went to Patrai were to be inscribed on a stele in the temple of the Syrian goddess. The fact that the stele bears over a hundred names indicates that Thouria did indeed win its case.

146. Pergamene judges arbitrate between Mytilene and Pitane (between c. 150 and 133)

Numerous fragments of a large marble stele discovered at Pergamon. H: c. 2.0 m; w: 0.62 m (above)-0.675 m (below); d: 0.215 m (above)-0.23 m (below). Three main documents are recorded in the inscription:

I: a decree of Pitane and the beginning of a decree of Mytilene.
II: the continuation of the decree of Mytilene.
III: a decree of Pergamon.
IV: lines 158–61, whose placement is uncertain.

Fränkel, *IPergamon* 245; Berard 35; *Dittenberger, *OGIS* 335; Hiller von Gaertringen, *IG* XII supp., pp. 48–49, no. 142; Daverio Rocchi 18.1 (lines 111–17).

O. Hoffmann, *Die griechischen Dialekte* II (Göttingen, 1893) p. 69, no. 95; A. Wilhelm, *AEM* 20 (1897) p. 57; Raeder 46; Tod 59, pp. 142f.; Meyer, *Grenzen,* pp. 106–7; L. Robert, *BCH* 49 (1925) pp. 219–21; Steinwenter, pp. 177, 180, 183, 188; L. Robert, *BCH* 50 (1926) p. 469; *SEG* IV.680; de Taube, pp. 44–45; L. Robert, *REA* 34 (1932) p. 523; Heuss, p. 144; Magie, *Buckler Studies,* p. 183; Robert, *REG* 1939, 31; Magie, *RRAM*, vol. 1, p. 114; vol. 2, p. 965; K. M. T. Atkinson, *Antichthon* 2 (1968) pp. 53–54; L. Robert, *Études anatoliennes* (Amsterdam, 1970) pp. 114–15 n. 1; W. Orth, *Königlicher Machtanspruch und städtische Freiheit* (Munich, 1977) pp. 111f.; L. Robert, *BCH* 101 (1977) p. 128; *SEG* XXVII.807; A. Chaniotis, *Historie und Historiker in den griechischen Inschriften* (Stuttgart, 1988) pp. 114–15, 274, 357–58; I. Savalli-Lestrade, *REG* 105 (1992) pp. 221–30.

2. More than one choice might have been available, given that the representatives of Thouria are said to have "preferred" Patrai. Cf. the conjectures in **46**.

I: The decree of Pitane and the beginning of the decree of Mytilene

[Πι]ταναίων.
στρατηγοὶ εἶπαν· ἐπειδὴ [Περγ]αμηνοί, συγγενεῖς ὄντ[ες καὶ] φίλοι καὶ εὐ-
νόω[ς]
διακείμενοι πρὸς τὴ[ν πόλιν ἡ]μῶν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ψηφίσμ[ά τε καὶ] πρεσβευτὰς ἀπε[ς]-
τάλκασιν πρὸς ἡμᾶ[ς περὶ τῶν ἐ]νεστηκότων πρὸς Μυ[τιληναίου]ς· Βάκχιον Εὐδήμου,
Ἀπολλόδωρον Ἀθ[ηνοδώρου, Διογ]ένην Ἀσκληπιάδου, Με[γίστερμον] Ἀττάλου, Σκάμων[α]
Ἀσκλάπωνος, τοὺς [ἐκπονήσον]τας ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ὑπεξ[αίρεσιν τῶν τε ἀ]ντι-
λεγομ[έ]-
νων, καὶ μὴ π⟨ο⟩ρρωτ[έρω σπουδῆι κα]ὶ φιλονικίαι ἐμφα[ν . . . 18 . . .] ἡγοῦνται[ι]
Περγαμηνοὶ τ[. . . 16 . . . ἀγ]αθά, οἵ τε πρεσβε[υταὶ τούτωι τῶι ἐπαγγέλ]ματι πολ-
λοὺς καὶ συμφ[όρους ἀμφοτέραι]ς ταῖς πόλεσιν [ἀνεδέξαντο π]όν[ους, καὶ σ]πουδῆι
καὶ [π]ροθυμ[ίαι ἄξιοι τῆς ἀπεσταλ]κυίας πατρίδος ε . . . . . πλη[. . . δί ἃ] δὴ καὶ
δεδόχ[θαι τῶι δήμωι· ψηφίσας]θαι Περγαμηνοῖς [γεγονό]σι καὶ φίλοις [καὶ σ]υν[γ]-
[ένεσι τῆι πόλει ἡμῶν, χάριν], ὅτι οὐ[κ ἐ]ν τῶι παρόν[τι κα]ιρῶι μόνον οὐδ[ε . . 10 . .]
- - - - αὐτῶν [ἀλλὰ] ἐκ παλαιῶ[ν χρ]όνων π[α]ρηκο[λούθηκαν ἡι]
[- - - εἰς τὸν ἡμέτερον δ]ῆμον ἔχ[ο]υσι προθυμίαι [κα]ὶ - - - - -
[- - - - - πασῶν πε]ριστάς[ε]ων κοινωνοῦντες τῶν - - - - - - -
[- - - - - τεχμήρ]ιο[ν] ἀλ[η]θινῆς ἐστιν εὐνοίας δ- - - - - - - -
[- - - - - πρ]ὸ[ς] ἀλλήλας φιλάνθρ[ω]π[α πολλά]κις - - - - -
- - - - -το γὰρ μὴ παραπέμπ[ειν . . .]ων- - - - - - - - - - -
[- - - - - ἀλ]λ' ἴδιον ἀγαθὸν ἡγ[ουμέν]ην θ- - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - καὶ φιλοίκειον ς . . . . της - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - -τη- - - - - - - τά τε τῆς συ[γ]γενεί[ας - - - -]
[- - - - - - τ]ὴν τῶν [. . . . κοιν]ωνίαν μέγα τι κα- - - - - -
[- - - - - - - ἀνή]κειν πρὸ[ς τοὺς συγ]γενεστάτους - - - - -
[- - - - - - - - - -διοικ]ουμένοις ὑπὸ Πε[ργ]αμηνῶν ἑ[τ]οί[μως - - -]
[- - - - - - - - - - -συντ]όμως καὶ μὴ φιλέχθρως ὑπε[ξ- - - - -]
- - - - - - - - - - - - -α αἱρούμεθα κριτὰς αὐτοὺς τοὺς - - - - - - - -
[- - - - - - - - - -περ]ὶ τῶν ἀντιλεγομένων, ἐπεὶ καὶ Μυτιληναῖο[ι ὡμολόγη]-
[σαν κριτὰς αὐτοὺς ἑλέσθα]ι, οἵτινες ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν παραγενόμενοι τοῦ ἐ[ν Πιτάνηι]
[μηνὸς - - - -, - - - - δὲ] ὡς Περγαμηνοὶ ἄγουσιν, ἄρξονται διακούειν κ[αὶ καθ' ἕ]-
[καστον σκοποῦντες ποή]σονται τὴν κρίσιν μεθ' ὅρκου καὶ τῶν γνωσθέντ[ων ἀπόφασιν]

[ἔγγραφον ἑκατέραι τ]ῶν πόλεων ἀποδώcουcιν· τὰ δὲ κριθέντα εἶ[ναι κύρια καὶ]
[ἀμετάθετα. ὡcαύτω]c δὲ καὶ τὰ cυνλυθέντα, ἐὰν ἀμφότεροι ἀνα[δέξωνται, γρά]-
[ψουcιν ἐν cτήλαι. cτηλ]ώcουcιν δὲ καὶ τοὺc προcδεομένου[c ἐκεῖ ὑπογραφῆc ἄλ]-
[λους ὅρους, μηδὲν ἀ]διέξακτον ἀπολείποντες, οὐδ' ἐὰν μη- - - -
- - -, οὐδὲν πρ]ὸc ἑαυτοὺc ἡγούμενοι, ἀ[λλὰ] κρίν[οντες ὁμοίως πάντα - - - -,]
[ὥcτε παντελῶc δι]εξαχθῆναι τὰ νείκη καὶ μ[ηδὲν ἔτι μήτε ἔγκλημα μήτε νεῖκοc]
[διαφορᾶc ἐχόμεν]ον ἀπολειφθῆναι το[υ- - - - - - - - - -]
[- - - - - - - - - - δ]ιὰ πρ[ογόνων - - - - - - - - - - -]
- - - - - - - - - - - - - -ο- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
[- - - - - - - - τ]ὰ cυcταθ[έντα - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
[- - - - - ἐπηι]νῆcθαι δὲ κ[αὶ τὸν δῆμον τὸν Περγαμηνῶν - - - -]
- - - - - - - - -ν αὐτοῖc, ἔτι δὲ - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
[- - - - - - τη]c cυνλύcεωc ἡ ε[- - - - - - - - - - - - πά]-
[cηι ἔcπε]υcαν ἐπιμελείαι, [ἐπαινέcαι δὲ καὶ τοὺc πρεcβευτὰc καὶ καλέcαι ἐπὶ]
[τὴν κοιν]ὴν ἑcτίαν, φρο[ντίcαι δὲ περὶ αὐτῶν τοὺc cτρατηγούc.]

[Μυτιληναίων.]
[ἔγνω ἀ β]όλλα καὶ ὁ δᾶμοc π[ερὶ τῶ ψαφίcματοc τῶ γενομένω ὑπὸ τῶ δάμω τῶ]
[Περγα]μήνων, ὃ ἀνέδωκ[αν ἄμμι οἱ αἱρέθεντεc πρέcβευται Βάκχιοc Εὐδάμω, Ἀπολλόδωροc]
[Ἀθαν]οδώρω, Διογένη[c Ἀcκλαπιάδα, Μεγίcτερμοc Ἀττάλω, Cκάμων Ἀcκλάπωνοc,]
[ὧ δι]αcάφηνται -
[. . . κ]αὶ πόλλ[α - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
. . . οιc τὰc προ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
. . . νοc ἀμφιcβ[ατ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
. ν ἂν λάβηται c[- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - ἀμ]-
[φ]οτέραιc ταὶc [πόλιαc - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - ἀνη]-
κόντεccι τοῖ[c -]
[ο]μένοιc ὐ[π- -]
ον καὶ τὰν -
[τ]ᾶc cυλ[λύcιοc - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - οὐδε]-
μίαc πε[- ἐόντεc]-
cι cυγγ[ενεcτάτοιcι - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
- -

II: Continuation of the Mytilenean decree and prescript of the Pergamene decree

- -Ο- - - - - - - - -
- -μένοιc- - - - - - -
[- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -κ]ίαν πρὸc Πιτ[αναίοιc - - - - - - -]
- διὸ καὶ τοὶc π- - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -c c[υ]ντόμως ὑπεξ- - - - - - - -

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - ἄ[γ]ρηται κρίτ[αι]c αὖτοις τοὶc - - - -
[- - - - - - - - - - - - - -τῶν ἀντιλε]γομένων, ἐπεὶ [κα]ὶ Π[ιτ]ά[ναιοι ὠμολό]-
[γησαν αὖτοις ἔλεσθαι, οἵτινες ἐπὶ τὰν χώραν π]αραγενόμενοι τῶ ἐν [Μυ-
τιλήναι μῆνος]
[- - -, - - - δέ ὠc Περγάμηνοι ἄγοισι, ἄρξοντ]αι διακούην καὶ κατ' ἔκας[τον
cκόπεντες]
[ποιήcονται τὰν κρίcιν μετ' ὅρκου καὶ τῶν γ]νωcθέντων ἀπόφαcιν ἔ[γγραφ]ον
ἐ[κ]α[τέ]-
[ραι τᾶν πολίων ἀποδώcοιcι· τὰ δὲ κρίθεντα ὐ]π[ά]ρξοιcι κύρια καὶ ἀμετάθετα.
ὡcαύτω[c]
[δὲ καὶ γράψοιcι ἐν cτάλᾳ, εἴ κε ἀμφότεροι ἀναδέξωνται τὰ ἐ]c cύλλυcιν.
cταλώcοιcι δὲ
[καὶ τοὶc προcδεομένοις ἔκει ὐ]πο[γράφας ἄλλοις ὅροις, μῆδεν] ἀδιέ[ξακτον
ἀπολεί]-
[ποντες - - - - - τ]ις ἢ παρ- - - - - -ν- - - - - - - - - -
- - - - παρέοντα[c . . . . .]ν τάχιστα, [μῆδεν ἔτι ἀπολειφθῆναι]
[μήτε ἔγκλημα μήτε νεῖκ]ος ἀλλάλα[ν διαφόρ]ας ἐχόμεν[ον -]
- - - - - - -ας τᾶν πολίω[ν . . . . . c]υμβόλαι[α - - - - - - -]
[- - - - - - - δ]ικάccαcθαι ἐν [μήνεccι τρ]ίcci ε- - - - - - -
[- - - - - - πρ]οθεcμίας τοὶc [. . . . . α]ὔτας - - - - - - -
[- - - - - δω]cιδικίαν κα[ὶ . .]α . . . . ἐπαί[νηcαι δὲ τοὶc πρεcβεύταις ἐπὶ τῶι]
[τὰν ἐπιδαμίαν ποήcας]θαι τὰν ἐν [Μυτιλήναι μετὰ φιλοπ]ονί[ας κα]ὶ ἀξί[ως
τῶν ἀποcτελλάντω]ν.
[τοὶc δὲ cτροτά]γοις τοὶc πε[ρ]ὶ Τ[α . . . . . ., ὅτι με]τὰ πλε[ίcτας εὐνοίας]
καὶ φι[λ]-
[ανθρωπίας . . . . . .]ως ἔκαcτα πε . . . 17 . . . ν ἐπρέcβε[υcαν,
οἱ βαcί]λεες,
. . . 13 . . . , καλ]εcκάτωcα[ν δὲ αὖτοις ἐπὶ ξέ]νια εἰc τὸ π[ρυτανήιον] ἐπὶ τὰν
[κοίναν ἐcτίαν. ὅπως] δὲ πρόξεν[οι καὶ πόλιται γ]ένωνται[ι τᾶc πόλι]ος, εἰcαγή-
[cαcθαι καὶ περὶ αὖτων τοὶc] c[τροτάγοις ἐν τοῖc χρ]όνοιc[ι τοῖc ἐκ τῶ]ν νόμων.

[Περγαμηνῶν.]

[- τ]οῦ βαcι[λέ]-
[ωc -]cθε- - - -

III: The Pergamene decree

- - - - - - - - - - - - - -α- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
. . . μην[ὶ - - - - - - - Π]ιτάνην κα[ὶ Μυτιλήνην - - - - - -]
[πρ]ὸc ἀλλήλαc . . . θέντεc ὑπ' αὐτῶ[ν - - - - - - - - - τὰ]
[ά]ποcταλέντα ὑπ' [αὐ]τῶν ἀποκρίματα Β[άκχιοc Εὐδήμου, Ἀπολλόδωροc
Ἀθηνοδώρου, Διογέν]-
[ηc Ἀ]cκληπιάδου, [Μεγ]ίcτερμοc Ἀττάλο[υ, Cκάμ]ων [Ἀcκλάπωνος - - - -
πᾶ]-
[cαν] cπουδὴν κα[ὶ φι]λοτιμίαν ἕνεκα τοῦ μ[ὴ φι]λέχ[θρωc, ἀλλ' ὡc μάλιcτα
οἷόν τε
[γένοιτ]ο αὐτοῖc [cυγ]γενικῶc ἐπιλῦcαι τὰ νείκ[η - - - - - -]

. . . . . σιν αὐτ[οὶ ἐ]πιδεξάμενοι τὴν κρίσιν π- - - - - - - - -
[. . . . ἐφε]ῖνα[ι τὰ κρί]ματα ἑαυτοῖς, ἵνα φιλι[κῶς - - - - - -]
[- - - - - - - - - - γένη]ται σύλλυσις οὐδ' ὑ- - - - - - - - -
[. . . Πιτα]ναῖ[οι - - - - - τ]ὴν ἐξουσίαν - - - - - - - - - - -
[. . . . ἐ]χόντω[ν - - - - - λοι]πῶν ἀν- - - - - - - - - - -
[. . . ἐ]χόμενοι -
. . . . . τα τὴν Ἀττα[ῖτῶν - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
. . . . . μέν τε αὐτῶν λ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
[συνθέ]ντες ἐκ τῶν εἰρη[μένων - - - - - - - - - - - ταῖς]
[πόλες]ιν εὔσημον καθες[τά]ναι δ- - - - - - - - - - - - -
. . . . τας ἐκ τῶν παρατ[εθέ]ντων ἡμῖ[ν - - - - - - - - - -]
[. . ἐκ]ατέρων ἐγδικούντω[ν ἐξ]εθέμεθ[α - - - - - - - - - - -]
. . . . τῆς ἐπὶ τῆς ῥάχεως κά[τ]ω εἰς τὸν [ῥύα]κα καὶ ὡς [ἡ ὁδὸς ἄγει καὶ αἱ στῆλαι κεῖν]-
[ται εἰ]ς τὴν ὁδὸν τὴν ὁρίζουσαν [τ]ήν τε Πιταναίαν καὶ [- - - - - καὶ ὡς ἡ ὁδὸς]
[ἄγ]ει καὶ αἱ στῆλαι κεῖνται ἕως τῶ[ν] πετρῶν τῶν δύο τῶν - - - - - - - - -
ἐποιήσαμεν, ἀπὸ δὲ τούτων εἰς τὸ[ν λει]μῶνα, ὡς ἡ στήλη κε[ῖτ]αι [καὶ ὡς ἡ ὁδὸς ἄγει εἰς]
[τ]ὴν Ἀστυρηνήν, ὡς αἱ στῆλαι κεῖν[ται εἰ]ς τὴν ὁδὸν καὶ ὡς ἡ ὁδὸ[ς ἄγει καὶ ὡς αἱ στῆ]-
[λα]ι κεῖνται παρὰ τὴν Ἀστυρηνὴν ἕως [τοῦ] τάφου τοῦ πρὸς τῆι ὁδῶι [τοῦ ἐπικαλουμένου]
['Ε]πικράτου, ἀπὸ δὲ τούτου ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρ[ια τὰ] πρὸς Ἀταρνίτας. ὑπεξηγμ[ένων δὲ - -]
[π]άντων, καθότι συνέθεντο πρὸς ἀλλ[ήλ]ους, μηδὲν ἔτι αὐτοῖς ἀπολει[φθῆναι μήτε ἔγκλη]-
μ[α μή]τε νεῖκος διαφορᾶς ἐχόμενον, καθό[τ]ι καὶ αὐτοὶ διὰ τῶν ἀποκριμάτω[ν ἐνέφανισαν, ἐμ]-
[φανιζόντω]ν δὲ ὁμοίως Μυτιληναίων Πιτ[α]ναίοις καὶ ὅτι ἐγ Καΐκου πεδίωι χ[ώραν - - -]
[- - - - - ἐσχ]ήκασιν αὐτῶν. ἀναχ[ωρ]ήσαντες εἰς Πέργαμον, κατὰ τὴ[ν τοῦ δήμου ἐπι]-
[ταγὴν καὶ τὴν βασιλέω]ς εὐδόκησιν, [ὁμό]σαντες ἐν τῶι ἱερῶι τῶν Διοσκόρ[ων - -]
[- - κεκρίκα]μεν καὶ τῶν μὲν Μυτιληναίων πα[ρεχομένων - -]
- - - - - Πιταναίοις καὶ ἑαυτοῖς καὶ παρεχομέ[νων - - - - - -]
- - - -ν, τῶν δὲ Πιταναίων ὁμοίως ἐκ τῶν ἱστ[οριογράφων - -]
[- - - - τὴν χ]ώραν ταύτην κατε[σχ]ηκότας ἑαυτοὺς - - - - -
[- - - - - πολλὰς γ]ενεὰς πα[ρ]' αὐτοῖς τετηρημένον ἡ με- - -
[- - - - - - - - - ἐπρ]ίατο ταῖς μεταπτώσεσιν τ- - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - -ας ἐλη[λυ]θέν[α]ι κυρ[ε]ί[α - - - - -]
[- - - ἐν πολλαῖς γε]νεαῖς τῶν τόπων ἐ[π . κ]ρα[τη]σ[αν - -]
- - - - - - - - - καὶ τεσσάρων ταλάντων καὶ μετὰ τα[ῦ]-
[τ]α Σελεύκο[υ τῆι πρὸς] Λυσ[ίμαχον μάχηι ἐπι]κρατήσαντος ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ διαδεξάμενος

τὴν βασιλείαν [Ἀντίο]χος τὴν πεδ[ιάδα χώ]ραν αὐτοῖς ἐπώλησεν ταλάντων τριακοσίω[ν]
τριάκοντα καὶ π[ροσει]σέπραξεν ἄλλ[α τ]άλαντα πεντήκοντα καὶ περὶ τούτων τὰς πίστεις
ἐ[γγ]ράφους παρατιθέ[αci]ν, δόντος [εἰς τ]αῦτα Πιταναίοις καὶ Φιλεταίρου τ[άλαντα - - - - -]
κοντα, καθότι ἐκ τῆς ἀν[αγεγραμμένης πα]ρ' ἡμῖν [ἐ]ν τῶι ἱερῶι τῆς Ἀθηνᾶ[c ἐπιστώ]ca[ντο στή]-
λης, κ[α]ὶ ὡς ἡ παγκτητικὴ τ[ῆ]c χ[ώρας κυρε]ία καὶ διὰ τῶν ἐγγράφω[ν ἐπὶ τῆς δια]νομῆς α[ὐ]-
τοῖς ὑπὸ τῶν κρατούντων παρεκε[χώρητ]ο, ἀναντιρήτως δεικ[νύντες ἐκ τ]ῶν καθιερ[ω]-
μένων στηλῶν ἔν τε Ἰλίωι καὶ Δήλ[ωι καὶ Ἐφέ]cωι, ἐν αἷς ἡ γε[γραμμένη ὑ]πὸ Ἀντιό[χου]
[ἐ]πιστολὴ περὶ τῆς κατὰ τὴν χώραν τα[ύτην κυρ]είας κατετέ[ταχτο, παρα]cχομένω[ν τε]
[κ]αὶ ὡς Εὐμένης παραλαβὼν τὰ πράγ[ματα τὴν Cε]λεύκου [ἐκύρωcεν ἐπ]ιστολὴν π[ρὸc]
[Πι]ταναίους, ἐν ἧι cὺν τοῖς ἄλλοις ἐγέγ[ραπτο κ]ατὰ λέ[ξιν ὧδε· "cυγχωροῦ-με]ν δὲ καὶ τ[ῆς χώ]-
[ρας εἰς τὸν ἀεὶ χρό]νον τὴν ἀναμφιc[βή]τη[τ]ον καὶ ὁμολογουμέ[νην κυρείαν τὴν παγκτητικ]ήν". ἀντιρρ[ήcεως]
[δὲ ἐπενεχθείcης - - κατὰ] τὴν κρίcιν τὴν τοῖς Ἐλαῖτα[ις γενομένην ὑπὸ Ἀντιό]χου ἡμ[ῖν]
[- - - - βα]cιλικὴν· οὐ μὴν ἀλλ' οὔτε λυcι[τελ- - - - - - -]
[- - - - - - - οὐ]δὲν οὐδ' ἂν ᾖ πάνυ μέγα τὴν τ- - - - - - -
[- - - - - - περὶ] πάντων τὸ δίκαιον θεωρο[ῦντες - - - - - -]
[- - - - - - - Πιταναίοις ἀ]ποκαθίcταμεν αὐτὴν κ- - - - - - -
[κατὰ τὴν γνώμην τὴν ἡμε]τέραν τὴν νῦν ἀcφα[λ- - - - - -]
[- - - - - - τὴν ὠ]νὴν τῆς χώρας γεγ[ενη- - - - - - - -]
- - - - - - - - - -οις ἐcτηλογράφη[ται - - - - - - - - - -]
[- - - - - - - Πιτανα?]ίοις, πρὸc δὲ το[ύτοις - - - - - - - -]
- - - - - - - - - - - - -οις ὁμοcαντ- - - - - - - - - - - -
[- - - - - - - - - - - - Πι]ταναίων ὑ- - - - - - - - - -
[- - - - - - - - - - - - ἐc]τι αὐτοῖc - - - - - - - - - - -
[- - - - - - - - - - - - α]ὐτοὶ δια- - - - - - - - - - - - -

IV: Lines of uncertain provenance

- - - - - - - - -καλ[ec- - - - -]
[- - - - - π]ρecβευταὶ ε- - - - - -
[- - - τοὺc ἀρ]μόζοντας λό[γους - -]
- - - - - - - - cπουδα[ίως - - - -]

I. 3: ψηφίcμ[ατα]: Fränkel, Berard. || 4: [νεικῶν ἐ]νεστηκότων: Fränkel, Berard. || 6: τοὺc [διακρινοῦν]τας: Fränkel, Berard. || 6–9: τοὺc [παρακαλέcον]τας ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ὑπεξ[ίcτacθαι τῶν ἀ]ντιλεγομέ|νων καὶ μὴ π⟨ο⟩ρρωτ[έρω εἶναι? ἐν

τῆ]ι φιλονικίαι, ἐμφαν[ίζοντας - - ὅσα] ἡγοῦνται| Περγαμηνοὶ τ[αῖς πόλεσιν ἔσεσθαι ἀγ]αθά, οἵ τε πρεσβε[υταὶ ἀκολούθως τῶι ψηφίς]ματι πολ|λοὺς καὶ συμφ[έροντας ἑκατέραι]ς ταῖς πόλεσιν [ἐποιήσαντ]ο λ[όγους]: Robert, Hiller von Gaertringen. || 6–7: ὑπεξ[ακούσαντας τῶν ἀ]ντιλεγομ[έ]|νων: Fränkel, Berard. || 10: [δηλα]δὴ: Fränkel. || 11: [τοῖς οὖ]σι: Fränkel, Berard. || 11–12: [ἀποκρίνας]θαι Περγαμηνοῖς, [συγγενέ]σι καὶ φίλοις [καὶ ε]ὔν[οις| οὖσιν τῆς πόλεως ἡμῶν], ὅτι κτλ.: Robert, Hiller von Gaertringen. || 13: π[α]ρῆκο[ν]: Fränkel, Berard. || 21: τά τε τῆς συγγενεί[ας δίκαια]: Robert. || 24: [τοῖς παρακαλ]ουμένοις ὑπὸ Πε[ργ]αμηνῶν ἑ[τ]οί[μως ἐπακολουθεῖν]: Robert, Hiller von Gaertringen. || 25: ὑπε[ξακου-]: Fränkel. || 28–29: τοῦ ἐ[ν ἡμῖν μη|νὸς]: Fränkel, Berard. || 40: [τ]ὰ συσθαθ[έντα]: Fränkel, Berard. || 44: [ἔσπε]υσεν ἐπιμελείαι: Fränkel, Berard. [ἐπηινῆσθαι]: Fränkel, Berard. || 45: φρο[ντίσαι δὲ τοὺς στρατηγοὺς τῆς ἀνακομιδῆς or τῆς παραπομπῆς αὐτῶν]: Robert. φρο[ντίσαι δὲ τοὺς στρατηγοὺς ὅπως ἐν τοῖς ἐννόμοις χ]ρόνοις τιμηθήσονται: Hiller von Gaertringen. || 47: [ἐπεὶ ἀ β]όλλα: Fränkel, Berard. || 47–48: [ἔγνω ἀ β]όλλα καὶ ὁ δᾶμος π[ερὶ ὧν προτίθεισι οἱ στραταγοὶ περὶ τῶ ψαφίσματος τῶ παρὰ Περγα]μήνων ὃ ἀνέδωκαν: Robert. [ἀπεστάλκασι ψάφισμα]| [Περγα]μήνων: Fränkel, Berard. || 56: τοῖ[σι]: Fränkel, Berard. || 60–61: [-τοι]|σι: Fränkel.

II. 67: ὑπεξ[ακου-]: Fränkel, Berard. || 68: α[ἰ]ρηται: Fränkel, Berard. ἄγρηται: Hiller von Gaertringen. || 70: τῶ ἐν [ἄμμιν μῆνος]: Fränkel, Berard. || 71–72: [σκοπέοντες| ποήσονται]: Fränkel, Berard. || 73: ἀμεθάθετα: Fränkel, Berard. || 74: ἐὰν: Fränkel, Berard. || 82: [ἐφε]σιδικίαν: Fränkel, Berard. [τοὶς πρεσβεύτας]: Fränkel, Berard. || 83: ἐν [ἄμμιν]: Fränkel, Berard. [τὰν ἐπιδαμίαν πεποιῆς]θαι τὰν ἐν [Μυτιλήναι εὐσχήμ]ον[α καὶ ἀξί[αν]: Robert, Hiller von Gaertringen. || 85: [καὶ ἐπιμελέ]ως: Fränkel, Berard. πε[πράχοτες τῶν δεόντω]ν: Fränkel, Berard. [κατ' εὔκ]λεες: Fränkel, Berard. || 86: ἀνακαρύξασθαι: Fränkel, Berard. || 86–87: ἐπὶ τὰν| [ἐπίουσαν ἀμέραν]: Fränkel, Berard. || 88: [χρ]όνοις: Fränkel, Berard. || 90–91: [ἐφιεμέν]ου βασι[λέ]ως Ἀττάλου?]: Fränkel. [ἐπὶ πρυτάνεως καὶ ἱερέως - - καὶ ἱερέως τ]οῦ βασι[λέ]ως Ἀττάλου Φιλαδέλφου - - καὶ ἱερέω]ς θε[ῶν Εὐσεβῶν - -]: Robert, Hiller von Gaertringen.

III. 94: [συν]θέντες: Fränkel, Berard. || 96–97: [εἰσενεγκάμενοι τὴν πᾶ|σαν] σπουδὴν κα[ὶ φι]λοτιμίαν: Robert. || 97: τοῦ [μήτε?] λεχ[θῆναι]: Fränkel. || 101: [πο]ιῆται: Fränkel, Berard. || 108: ὁ[ρισμῶι?]: Fränkel. || 116: [τοῦ ἐγγεγραμμένου?]: Fränkel. || 117: τὰ ὄρ[η]: Fränkel, Berard. ὑπεξηγμ[ένα]: Fränkel, Berard. || 117–118: [περὶ| π]άντων: Fränkel. || 122: [καθί]σαντες ἐν τῶι ἱερῶι τῶν Διοσκούρων: Robert, Hiller von Gaertringen. || 125: ἱστ[ορημένων]: Fränkel, Berard. || 135–136: τ[άλαντα τεσσαρά?]|κοντα: Fränkel. || 138: παρεκε[ῖ ἐδέδοτ]ο, ἀναντιρ⟨ρ⟩ήτως: Fränkel, Berard. || 141: Εὐμένης παραλαβὼν τὰ πράγ[ματα παρὰ Σε]λεύκου [ἔγραψεν ἐπ]ιστολὴν: Hiller von Gaertringen. τὰ πράγ[ματα τὰ or παρὰ Σε]λεύκου: Robert. || 142: ἐγέγ[ραπτο κ]ατὰ λέ[ξιν ταῦτα]: Fränkel, Berard. || 142–143: [τὴν κυρεία]ν δὲ καὶ τ[ὴν εἰς| τὸν πάντα χρό]νον: Fränkel, Berard. || 143: [οὐ μ]ὴν ἀντιρρ[ητέον]: Fränkel. || 145: [-]ιαν γιν[-]: Hiller von Gaertringen. || 146: [α]ὐτῶν ἀρ[-]: Hiller von Gaertringen. || 148: δικαίαν κα[- - ἀ]ποκαθίσταμεν αὐτὴν κ[-]: Hiller von Gaertringen. || 149: [.]τε πολὺ καλλ[ι-]: Hiller von Gaertringen. ἀσφα[λῶς]: Fränkel, Berard. || 150:

[-o]ύσης θεωρο[υ-]: Hiller von Gaertringen. γεγ[ενημένην]: Berard. || 151–156: [. .]ν αὐτῆς ἐκ [- -]οις ἐστηλογράφη[ται - -| . .] ὑπαρχουσα[- - Πιταναί]οις, πρὸς δὲ το[ύτοις - - δι|α]νομὴν κατες[- -]οις ὁμόσαντ[- - παρ|ε]κάλουν Μυτιλ[ην- - Πι]ταναίων ὑ[- - καθό|τι] συνέθεντο π[ρὸς ἀλλήλους μηδὲν ἔ]τι αὐτοῖς [ἀπολειφθῆναι μήτε ἔγκλημα μήτε| ν]εῖκος διαφορᾶ[ς ἐχόμενον, καθότι καὶ α]ὐτοὶ διὰ [τῶν ἀποκριμάτων ἐνεφάνισαν - -]: Robert, Hiller von Gaertringen.

This very lengthy, if rather fragmented, inscription from Pergamon offers some insights into the procedures of international arbitration from the point of view of all concerned; the collection of documents includes decrees of the two disputants as well as a decree of the arbitrating state. The inscription opens with a decree of the mainland Asia Minor town of Pitane. Pitane and its neighbour across the straits, Mytilene, both claimed a certain territory lying on the mainland, and the dispute had apparently lasted for some time.[1] The decree of Pitane was given in response to an embassy from Pergamon, an embassy that had come to Pitane in order to help to bring about an arbitration to settle the matter. It is not certain whether Pergamon took the initiative or was responding to a plea from the disputants. Although the king is mentioned in this inscription, it seems to have been the δῆμος of Pergamon that was instrumental in carrying out this task. The decree of Pitane, and that of Mytilene, which follows it and is couched in almost exactly the same terms, form the *compromissum*, the agreement to submit voluntarily to arbitration. Profuse expressions of gratitude are given to the Pergamenes for their service in bringing about this initial agreement.[2] They had sent the same group of five ambassadors both to Pitane and Mytilene in order to negotiate an agreement between the two. Pitane and Mytilene accepted the good offices of the Pergamene embassy and agreed to settle their dispute by arbitration. Apparently the five ambassadors so impressed the Pitaneans and Mytileneans that they chose the same five to act as an arbitral board (lines 26f., 68f.). Despite the fact that Pitane was a member of the Attalid sphere, Mytilene appears to have entertained no suspicions about the objectivity of the chosen arbitrators.

The main point at issue was the question of the mainland territory (lines 33–34, 74–75). Nevertheless, it seems that Pitane and Mytilene may have had some other disputes that required settlement as well (lines 36f., 77f.). The nature of these differences is not clarified; perhaps there were some private suits outstanding as well as the main public issue of national territory.[3] Whatever

1. Lines 123f. Cf. the dispute between Priene and the island of Samos for mainland territory (the "Peraia"): **26**, **74**, **99**, **160**. Fränkel (pp. 151f.) believed that a fragment of an inscription from Pergamon published by LeBas/Waddington (1720b) was to be connected to this dispute.

2. The Pergamenes are said to be friends and kinsmen of both states, and to have had goodwill towards both sides.

3. The term [c]υμβόλαι[α] appears (line 79).

the case, it was to be the task of the arbitrators to ensure that no hostilities or unsettled legal questions remained between Pitane and Mytilene after a period of three months had passed. Unfortunately much of the original agreement as to the nature and procedures of the arbitration is fragmented, both in the Pitanean and Mytilenean decrees. It is clear that the judges were nominated by Pitane and Mytilene, not by Pergamon as the arbitrating state, in that they chose the embassy of five to act also as judges. The tribunal was to listen to the testimony brought forward by both parties, examine the evidence, and make its judgement (lines 29f., 71f.). A written copy of the final judgement was to be provided for both parties; that judgement was to be conclusive and irrefutable.[4] As often, some hope was held out for a reconciliation of the two parties, rather than a formal judgement.

The decree of Pergamon that follows those of Mytilene and Pitane is also much fragmented but does provide more information on the subject of the dispute. The judgement, and probably the examination of archival and historical evidence, as opposed to the tour of the land itself and the demarcation of boundary points, took place at Pergamon, the judges' home. The history of the disputed land was scrutinized, and Pitane's claim was recognized as legal and upheld.[5] The legalistic issue that appears to have been under debate was whether conquest conferred right of ownership. Again the text is fragmented, but the first historical fact we can discern is that the disputed land apparently represented part of the territory conquered by Seleukos I when he defeated Lysimachos at Koroupedion in 281. It was then sold to Pitane by Seleukos's successor, Antiochos I, for a total price of 380 talents. The Pitanean advocates were able to produce documentary proof of this purchase, and letters from Antiochos, as well as Eumenes I, recognizing Pitane's ownership of the land.[6] No doubt Pitane argued that Seleukos I's conquest gave the Seleukids the right to dispose of the land as they pleased, and therefore that the Pitanean purchase of it was legal. Mytilene, on the other hand, would have argued that the land still legally belonged to it, as it had been taken away from Mytilene only by force of arms.

The reference to the king in the Pergamene decree indicates a date prior to the end of the Pergamene monarchy in 133 and the establishment of the Roman province of Asia. The letterforms, however, indicate that the inscription should be dated to the later years of Attalid rule. A date sometime after 150 seems a reasonable conjecture.[7]

4. Lines 31–32; cf. **1**, **33**, **40**, **83**, **92**, **109**, **145**.

5. Line 125: τῶν δὲ Πιταναίων ὁμοίως ἐκ τῶν ἱστ[οριογράφων]. Cf. **26**, lines 12–13, and **74**, lines 101f.

6. See McShane, p. 73 n. 47. Further Seleukid involvement with the case may be inferred from line 144 (a judgement of an Antiochos vis-à-vis Elaia?).

7. See Dittenberger (*OGIS*) and Hiller von Gaertringen (*IG* XII supp., p. 49).

147. Conflict between the Achaian League and Sparta (150–147)

I: Pausanias 7.12.4–5.
II: Pausanias 7.12.8–9.
III: Pausanias 7.13.2–3 and 5.
IV: Pausanias 7.14.1–4.
V: Polybios 38.11.2.
VI: Cassius Dio 21.72.
VII: Zonaras 9.31.

Cf. Polybios 38.9–13; Justin 43.1–2.

Shimron, pp. 131f.; Will, vol. 2, pp. 390f.; Gruen, pp. 520f.; Piper, pp. 135f.; Bastini, pp. 195f.; Cartledge/Spawforth, *Sparta*, pp. 87f. See also the bibliography cited in **96**.

I: Pausanias 7.12.4–5

Λακεδαιμόνιοι περὶ ἀμφισβητησίμου χώρας καταφεύγουσιν ἐπὶ τὴν Ῥωμαίων βουλήν· καταφεύγουσι δὲ αὐτοῖς προεῖπεν ἡ βουλὴ δικάζεσθαι τὰ ἄλλα πλὴν ψυχῆς ἐν συνεδρίῳ τῷ Ἀχαιῶν. ἡ μὲν δὴ ταῦτα ἀπεκρίνατο· Δίαιος δὲ οὐ τὸν ὄντα ἔλεγεν Ἀχαιοῖς λόγον, ψυχαγωγῶν δὲ αὐτοὺς ἔφασκε παρὰ τῆς Ῥωμαίων σφίσιν ἐφεῖσθαι βουλῆς καὶ θάνατον ἀνδρὸς καταγνῶναι τῶν ἐκ Σπάρτης. (5) οἱ μὲν δὴ δικάζειν Λακεδαιμονίοις ἠξίουν καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς ἑκάστου ψυχῆς, Λακεδαιμόνιοι δὲ οὔτε ἀληθῆ συνεχώρουν Δίαιον λέγειν καὶ ἀνάγειν ἤθελον ἐπὶ τὴν Ῥωμαίων βουλήν. Ἀχαιοὶ δὲ ἀντελαμβάνοντο αὖθις ἄλλου λόγου, πόλεις ὅσαι τελοῦσιν ἐς Ἀχαιοὺς μηδεμίαν ἐφ' ἑαυτῆς καθεστηκέναι κυρίαν ἄνευ τοῦ κοινοῦ τοῦ Ἀχαιῶν παρὰ Ῥωμαίους ἰδίᾳ πρεσβείαν ἀποστέλλειν.

II: Pausanias 7.12.8–9

Δίαιος δὲ ἐς ἀντιλογίαν Μεναλκίδᾳ κατιστὰς ἐπὶ τῆς βουλῆς πολλὰ μὲν εἶπε, τὰ δὲ ἤκουσεν οὐ σὺν κόσμῳ. (9) καί σφισιν ἀπεκρίνατο ἡ βουλὴ ἀποστέλλειν πρέσβεις, οἳ κρινοῦσιν ὅσα Λακεδαιμονίοις καὶ Ἀχαιοῖς διάφορα ἦν ἐς ἀλλήλους. καὶ τοῖς ἐκ Ῥώμης πρέσβεσι σχολαιτέρα πως ἐγίνετο ἡ ὁδός, ὥστε ἐξαπατᾶν ὑπῆρχεν ἐξ ἀρχῆς Διαίῳ τε Ἀχαιοὺς καὶ Μεναλκίδᾳ Λακεδαιμονίους· τοὺς μὲν δὴ παρῆγεν ὁ Δίαιος ὡς τὰ πάντα ἔπεσθαι Λακεδαιμόνιοί σφισιν ὑπὸ τῆς Ῥωμαίων βουλῆς εἰσιν ἐγνωσμένοι, Λακεδαιμονίους δὲ ὁ Μεναλκίδας ἠπάτα παντελῶς τοῦ συνεδρεύειν ἐς τὸ Ἀχαϊκὸν ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων αὐτοὺς ἀπηλλάχθαι.

III: Pausanias 7.13.2–3 and 5

Μέτελλος δὲ ἄνδρας ὑπὸ τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἀπεσταλμένους βουλῆς ἐπὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ πράγματα ἐκέλευε, πρὶν ἢ ἐς τὴν Ἀσίαν διαβῆναι, τοῖς ἡγεμόσιν

αὐτοὺς τοῖς Ἀχαιῶν ἐς λόγους ἐλθεῖν, ὅπλα μὲν ἐπὶ τὴν Σπάρτην μὴ ἐπιφέρειν σφίσιν ἀπαγορεύσοντας, τὴν δὲ ἐκ Ῥώμης παρουσίαν τῶν ἀνδρῶν προεροῦντας μένειν, οἳ κατὰ τοῦτο ἦσαν ἀπεσταλμένοι Λακεδαιμονίοις δικασταὶ καὶ Ἀχαιοῖς γενέσθαι. (3) οἱ μὲν δὴ τὰ ἐντεταλμένα Δαμοκρίτῳ καὶ Ἀχαιοῖς ἐπήγγελλον ἐφθακόσιν ἔξοδον ἐπὶ Λακεδαίμονα πεποιῆσθαι καὶ—ἐώρων γὰρ πρὸς τὴν παραίνεσιν ἀνθεστηκότα τὰ Ἀχαιῶν—ἀπηλλάσσοντο ἐς τὴν Ἀσίαν· ... (5) Δίαιος δὲ Ἀχαιῶν μετὰ Δαμόκριτον στρατηγεῖν ᾑρημένος ἀποστείλαντι αὖθις Μετέλλῳ πρέσβεις ὡμολόγησε μηδένα ἐπάξειν Λακεδαιμονίοις πόλεμον, ἀλλὰ ἔστ' ἂν ἥκωσιν ἐκ Ῥώμης ἀναμενεῖν τοὺς διαλλακτάς.

IV: Pausanias 7.14.1–4

Ἀφίκοντο δὲ ἐς τὴν Ἑλλάδα καὶ οἱ ἀποσταλέντες ἐκ Ῥώμης Λακεδαιμονίοις δικασταὶ καὶ Ἀχαιοῖς γενέσθαι, ἄλλοι τε καὶ Ὀρέστης· ὁ δὲ τούς τε ἐν ἑκάστῃ πόλει τῶν Ἀχαιῶν ἔχοντας τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ Δίαιον ἐκάλει παρ' αὐτόν. ἀφικομένοις δὲ ἔνθα ἔτυχεν αὐτὸς ἐσῳκισμένος, ἀπεγύμνου τὸν πάντα σφίσιν ἤδη λόγον, ὡς δίκαια ἡγοῖτο ἡ Ῥωμαίων βουλὴ μήτε Λακεδαιμονίους τελεῖν ἐς τὸ Ἀχαϊκὸν μήτε αὐτὴν Κόρινθον, ἀφεῖσθαι δὲ καὶ Ἄργος καὶ Ἡράκλειαν τὴν πρὸς Οἴτῃ καὶ Ὀρχομενίους Ἀρκάδας συνεδρίου τοῦ Ἀχαιῶν· γένους τε γὰρ αὐτοῖς οὐδὲν τοῦ Ἀχαιῶν μετεῖναι καὶ ὕστερον τὰς πόλεις προσχωρῆσαι ταύτας πρὸς τὸ Ἀχαϊκόν. (2) ταῦτα Ὀρέστου λέγοντος οἱ ἄρχοντες τῶν Ἀχαιῶν οὐδὲ τὸν πάντα ὑπομείναντες ἀκοῦσαι λόγον ἔθεον ἐς τὸ ἐκτὸς τῆς οἰκίας καὶ ἐκάλουν Ἀχαιοὺς ἐς ἐκκλησίαν· ... (3) ἀποστέλλουσι δὲ καὶ ἐς Ῥώμην ἄλλους τε Ἀχαιῶν τῶν ἐν τέλει καὶ Θεαρίδαν· ὡς δὲ ἀπῆλθον, ἐντυχόντες κατὰ τὴν ἄνοδον Ῥωμαίων πρέσβεσιν ἐπὶ τὰ Λακεδαιμονίων καὶ Ἀχαιῶν ὕστερον ἢ Ὀρέστης ἀπεσταλμένοις, ὀπίσω καὶ αὐτοὶ τρέπονται. (4) Διαίῳ δὲ ἐξήκοντος τοῦ χρόνου τῆς ἀρχῆς στρατηγεῖν ὑπὸ Ἀχαιῶν ᾑρέθη Κριτόλαος. τοῦτον δριμὺς καὶ σὺν οὐδενὶ λογισμῷ τὸν Κριτόλαον πολεμεῖν πρὸς Ῥωμαίους ἔρως ἔσχε· καὶ—ἔτυχον γὰρ τότε ἤδη οἱ παρὰ Ῥωμαίων ἥκοντες τὰ Λακεδαιμονίων καὶ Ἀχαιῶν δικάσαι—ἀφίκετο μὲν ἐν Τεγέᾳ τῇ Ἀρκάδων τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ἐς λόγους ὁ Κριτόλαος, ἀθροῖσαι δὲ Ἀχαιούς σφισιν ἐς κοινὸν σύλλογον οὐδαμῶς ἤθελεν.

V: Polybios 38.11.2

Παραγενομένων γὰρ εἰς τὴν Τεγέαν τῶν περὶ τὸν Σέξτον καὶ τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίους ἐπισπασαμένων χάριν τοῦ σύμφωνον αὐτοῖς γενέσθαι πρὸς τοὺς Ἀχαιοὺς τήν τε περὶ τῶν προγεγονότων ἐγκλημάτων δικαιοδοσίαν (καὶ) τὴν κατὰ τὸν πόλεμον ἐποχήν, ἕως ἂν πέμψωσι Ῥωμαῖοι τοὺς περὶ τῶν ὅλων ἐπισκεψομένους.

VI: Cassius Dio 21.72

Ὅτι ἤρξαν τῆς διαφορᾶς οἱ Ἀχαιοί, τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις ἐγκαλοῦντες (διηνέχθησαν γὰρ ἀλλήλοις) ὡς τῶν συμβεβηκότων σφίσιν αἰτίοις γεγονόσι, Διαίου ὅτι μάλιστα τοῦ στρατηγοῦ αὐτοὺς ἐνάγοντος. καὶ τῶν γε Ῥωμαίων

καταλλακτὰς αὐτοῖς πολλάκις πεμψάντων οὐκ ἐπείσθησαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς πρέσβεις . . . παρ' ὀλίγον ἦλθον ἀποκτεῖναι.

VII: Zonaras 9.31

Ἤρξαντο δὲ τῆς διαφορᾶς οἱ Ἀχαιοί, τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις ἐγκαλοῦντες ὡς αἰτίοις τῶν συμβεβηκότων αὐτοῖς· καὶ τῶν Ῥωμαίων διαλλακτὰς αὐτοῖς στειλάντων οὐκ ἐπείσθησαν, ἀλλὰ πρὸς πόλεμον ὥρμησαν, Κριτόλαον προστησάμενοι.

Although we have little specific information on relations between Sparta and the Achaian League from the time of Kallikrates' return of the exiles until about 150, it is impossible to suppose that the tensions ever dissipated completely. The dispute over the Belbinatis in the late 160s between Sparta and Megalopolis led to another confrontation with the League (**135**, **137**). Sparta was evidently still trying to claim its ancestral prerogatives, prerogatives endlessly denied it through the mechanism of arbitration. The bitterness that both Achaians and Lakedaimonians evinced at the trial shortly after 163 is proof of continuing hostility. The arbitrators, although they worked in a spirit of conciliation, were forced in the end to make a formal judgement. The long-standing hostilities prevented them from bringing both sides to a voluntary agreement. Nevertheless, we do not hear of any major disputes in these decades, and Sparta was apparently well-enough integrated into the League that a Spartan, Menalkidas, could be elected Achaian strategos for 151/0 (Paus. 7.11.7). As Pausanias tells the story, it was Menalkidas's alienation from the League, in the wake of his quarrels with Kallikrates and Diaios, and his subsequent separatist activities that again led to an outbreak of open hostilities between Sparta and Achaia, and the further involvement of Rome.

An embassy from Sparta came to Rome, apparently during Diaios's *strategia*, and therefore in the winter of 150/49. Menalkidas may well have instigated and led this deputation. The purpose of this embassy was to bring up again the problem of a disputed territory. Given the fact that the Belbinatis had been an issue a decade and a half before, it is probably the territory referred to here.[8] The Spartans apparently sought a new adjudication on the matter but received only a reiteration of the Roman position of three decades previously: except for capital cases, any disputes Sparta might have were subject to the jurisdiction of the Achaian League (**111**). Although the senate had drawn attention to their ruling that capital cases were to be referred to ξενικὰ δικαστήρια, the Achaian strategos Diaios nevertheless managed to represent the senate as having given the opposite response to the Spartan embassy: that the Achaian League had total

8. The Belbinatis had been detached from Sparta and given to Megalopolis by Philopoimen in 188; it was the subject of Sparta's dispute with Megalopolis in 163 (**135**). Walbank suggests that Argive territory was also involved (*Comm*, vol. 3, p. 702).

jurisdiction, including that over capital cases. As for the Spartans, at this stage they had little choice but to bow to Achaian pressures, and Sparta's anti-Achaian leaders, including Menalkidas, went into exile (Paus. 7.12.6–8).

The Romans had agreed to send a commission of arbitrators to investigate and set right matters between Achaia and Sparta, another attempt in a long series. But dilatoriness was a common characteristic of Roman investigatory legations and arbitral commissions, and this one was no exception. Metellus, the Roman commander in Macedon, attempted to restrain both sides from taking irrevocable action until the arbitrators arrived, but the long wait undermined the Roman request, as did the nationalist policies of some Achaian politicians, such as Damokritos, the strategos of 149/8. When Sparta seceded, he declared war on it, a war that was continued by Diaios, the strategos of 148/7, when Menalkidas provoked renewed hostilities. It was not until the late summer or early fall of 147 that the Roman arbitral commission, under L. Aurelius Orestes, finally arrived in Corinth. All along the Roman legates had been advertised as arbitrators, who were coming to judge impartially the disputes between Sparta and Achaia. When Orestes arrived, however, and summoned representatives of all parties to meet with him in Corinth, there was no question of arbitration, and the commission made no attempt to deal with specific points in dispute. Justin (34.1.5) claims that the legates had secret orders from the senate, now that Rome was victorious in Macedon, to dissolve the Achaian *koinon*, and their pronouncement at Corinth could certainly have given rise to that interpretation. Orestes announced that it had been decided that not only Sparta, but also Corinth, Argos, Orchomenos in Arkadia, and Herakleia in Trachis should be detached from the League.[9]

In the wake of this shock, and the anti-Roman response it elicited, the senate appointed another commission under S. Julius Caesar, in order to "censure but conciliate" the Achaians (Paus. 7.14.2–3; Polyb. 38.9). Polybios and Pausanias both imply that the commission of Sextus might have been more prepared than Orestes to act as a truly arbitral commission, as far as specific Achaian-Spartan disputes went. However, the view that Rome was planning to reverse its policy of separating Sparta, Corinth, and the rest from the League is questionable.[10] Caesar may have taken a more conciliatory tone, but it seems that the time had come for a Roman stand on the Sparta-Achaia issue. Hence the choice

9. Cf. Polyb. 23.9.13, which records the senate's exasperation with Achaia in 183/2.

10. The passage in Polybios has been emended; see Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 3, p. 700. Gruen (p. 521, and *JHS* 96) believes that the threat to detach these places from the League may have been the work of Orestes alone, and not the Roman senate; and that Caesar therefore did not reiterate the demand. This is certainly possible, and Roman legates such as Orestes did on occasion act with rather more authority than they truly had. Nevertheless, this was an exceedingly outrageous threat for a Roman representative to have made without official backing.

for the Achaians was either to acquiesce in the senate's demands or to fight Rome. The disputes between Sparta and the League, and the continued efforts to have the Romans arbitrate them, had now given way to much graver issues as Rome contemplated clipping Achaia's wings. When Kritolaos, the strategos for 147/6, obstructed the work of the Roman commission at Tegea, where the Spartans and Achaians were to discuss their differences, the Romans broke off the negotiations. Kritolaos spent the winter of 147/6 persuading the Greeks to prepare for a war with Rome, and at the spring meeting in 146 the Achaian League voted for war, "nominally against Sparta, but really against Rome" (Polyb. 38.13.6).

148. Rome attempts to mediate between Prousias II and Nikomedes (149)

I: Diodoros 32.20.
II: Appian *Mithridatica* 6–7.
III: Livy *Periocha* 50.

Cf. Justin 34.4; Plutarch *Cato maior* 9.

McShane, p. 190; Hansen[2], pp. 136–38; Will, vol. 2, pp. 384–85; Gruen, pp. 114, 590; Sherwin-White, p. 46.

I: Diodoros 32.20

Ὅτι ἡ σύγκλητος πρεσβευτὰς ἐξαπέστειλεν εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν τοὺς καταλύσοντας τὸν πόλεμον Νικομήδους καὶ Προυσίου τοῦ ἰδίου πατρός, καὶ εἵλετο ἄνδρας εἰς τὴν πρεσβείαν Λικίννιον ποδαγρικὸν καὶ Μαγκῖνον, ὃς κατατετρημένος ἦν τὴν κεφαλὴν κεραμῖδος ἐπιπεσούσης καὶ τὸ πλεῖον μέρος τῶν ὀστῶν ἐξῃρημένος, καὶ Λεύκιον παντελῶς ἀναίσθητον. ὁ δὲ Κάτων ἀφηγούμενος τοῦ συνεδρίου καὶ συνέσει διαφέρων εἶπεν ἐν τῇ συγκλήτῳ διότι πρεσβείαν ἀποστέλλομεν οὔτε πόδας οὔτε κεφαλὴν οὔτε καρδίαν ἔχουσαν.

II: Appian *Mithridatica* 6–7

Ταῦτα δ' εἰπὼν ἔπεμπεν ἐς Ῥώμην τοὺς Νικομήδους καὶ Ἀττάλου κατηγορήσοντας τε καὶ προκαλεσομένους ἐς κρίσιν.... ὁ δὲ Ῥωμαίων στρατηγὸς ἐν ἄστει οὔτε αὐτίκα ἐπῆγεν ἐπὶ τὴν βουλὴν τοὺς τοῦ Προυσίου πρέσβεις, χαριζόμενος Ἀττάλῳ· ἐπαγαγών τέ ποτε, ψηφισαμένης τῆς βουλῆς τὸν στρατηγὸν αὐτὸν ἐλέσθαι τε καὶ πέμψαι πρέσβεις οἳ διαλύσουσι τὸν πόλεμον, εἵλετο τρεῖς ἄνδρας, ὧν ὁ μὲν τὴν κεφαλήν ποτε λίθῳ πληγεὶς ἀσχήμονας ἐπέκειτο ὠτειλάς, ὁ δὲ τοὺς πόδας διέφθαρτο ὑπὸ ῥεύματος, ὁ δ' ἠλιθιώτατος ἐνομίζετο εἶναι, ὥστε Κάτωνα τὴν πρεσβείαν ἐπισκώπτοντα εἰπεῖν τὴν πρεσβείαν ταύτην μήτε νοῦν ἔχειν μήτε πόδας μήτε κεφαλήν. (7) οἱ μὲν δὴ πρέσβεις ἐς Βιθυνίαν

for the Achaians was either to acquiesce in the senate's demands or to fight Rome. The disputes between Sparta and the League, and the continued efforts to have the Romans arbitrate them, had now given way to much graver issues as Rome contemplated clipping Achaia's wings. When Kritolaos, the strategos for 147/6, obstructed the work of the Roman commission at Tegea, where the Spartans and Achaians were to discuss their differences, the Romans broke off the negotiations. Kritolaos spent the winter of 147/6 persuading the Greeks to prepare for a war with Rome, and at the spring meeting in 146 the Achaian League voted for war, "nominally against Sparta, but really against Rome" (Polyb. 38.13.6).

148. Rome attempts to mediate between Prousias II and Nikomedes (149)

I: Diodoros 32.20.
II: Appian *Mithridatica* 6–7.
III: Livy *Periocha* 50.

Cf. Justin 34.4; Plutarch *Cato maior* 9.

McShane, p. 190; Hansen[2], pp. 136–38; Will, vol. 2, pp. 384–85; Gruen, pp. 114, 590; Sherwin-White, p. 46.

I: Diodoros 32.20

Ὅτι ἡ σύγκλητος πρεσβευτὰς ἐξαπέστειλεν εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν τοὺς καταλύσοντας τὸν πόλεμον Νικομήδους καὶ Προυσίου τοῦ ἰδίου πατρός, καὶ εἵλετο ἄνδρας εἰς τὴν πρεσβείαν Λικίννιον ποδαγρικὸν καὶ Μαγκῖνον, ὃς κατατετρημένος ἦν τὴν κεφαλὴν κεραμῖδος ἐπιπεσούσης καὶ τὸ πλεῖον μέρος τῶν ὀστῶν ἐξῃρημένος, καὶ Λεύκιον παντελῶς ἀναίσθητον. ὁ δὲ Κάτων ἀφηγούμενος τοῦ συνεδρίου καὶ συνέσει διαφέρων εἶπεν ἐν τῇ συγκλήτῳ διότι πρεσβείαν ἀποστέλλομεν οὔτε πόδας οὔτε κεφαλὴν οὔτε καρδίαν ἔχουσαν.

II: Appian *Mithridatica* 6–7

Ταῦτα δ' εἰπὼν ἔπεμπεν ἐς Ῥώμην τοὺς Νικομήδους καὶ Ἀττάλου κατηγορήσοντας τε καὶ προκαλεσομένους ἐς κρίσιν.... ὁ δὲ Ῥωμαίων στρατηγὸς ἐν ἄστει οὔτε αὐτίκα ἐπῆγεν ἐπὶ τὴν βουλὴν τοὺς τοῦ Προυσίου πρέσβεις, χαριζόμενος Ἀττάλῳ· ἐπαγαγών τέ ποτε, ψηφισαμένης τῆς βουλῆς τὸν στρατηγὸν αὐτὸν ἐλέσθαι τε καὶ πέμψαι πρέσβεις οἳ διαλύσουσι τὸν πόλεμον, εἵλετο τρεῖς ἄνδρας, ὧν ὁ μὲν τὴν κεφαλήν ποτε λίθῳ πληγεὶς ἀσχήμονας ἐπέκειτο ὠτειλάς, ὁ δὲ τοὺς πόδας διέφθαρτο ὑπὸ ῥεύματος, ὁ δ' ἠλιθιώτατος ἐνομίζετο εἶναι, ὥστε Κάτωνα τὴν πρεσβείαν ἐπισκώπτοντα εἰπεῖν τὴν πρεσβείαν ταύτην μήτε νοῦν ἔχειν μήτε πόδας μήτε κεφαλήν. (7) οἱ μὲν δὴ πρέσβεις ἐς Βιθυνίαν

ἀφίκοντο, καὶ προσέταccον αὐτοῖς τὸν πόλεμον ἐκλῦcαι, Νικομήδους δὲ καὶ Ἀττάλου cυγχωρεῖν ὑποκρινομένων οἱ Βιθυνοὶ διδαχθέντες ἔλεγον οὐκ εἶναι δυνατοὶ φέρειν ἔτι τὴν ὠμότητα τὴν Προυσίου, φανεροὶ μάλιcτα αὐτῷ γενόμενοι δυcχεραίνοντες. οἱ μὲν δὴ πρέcβεις, ὡς οὔπω Ῥωμαίων τάδε πυθομένων, ἐπανῄεcαν ἄπρακτοι.

III: Livy *Periocha* 50

Prusias rex Bithyniae, omnium humillimorumque vitiorum, a Nicomede filio, adiuvante Attalo rege Pergami, occisus. . . . cum III legati ad pacem inter Nicomeden et Prusiam faciendam ab Romanis missi essent, cum unus ex his multis cicatricibus sartum caput haberet, alter pedibus aeger esset, tertius ingenio socors haberetur, M. Cato dixit eam in legationem, nec caput nec pedes nec cor habere.

Shortly after Prousias II's war against Attalos II was brought to an end through Roman mediation (**142**), Prousias found himself at war with his own son Nikomedes. Attalos joined with the Bithynian prince in the effort to dethrone his father. This action constituted a revolt on the part of Nikomedes, and aggression on the part of Attalos; it is interesting to see that it is Prousias who is accused, in an inscription from Pergamon, of breaking the Roman-arranged treaty of 154.[1] At the time of that treaty, the Romans had acted to put a stop to war between Pergamon and Bithynia. Then it had been their friend Pergamon who was endangered. Now it was Prousias who was threatened and besieged in Nikomedeia. The senate sent a commission to put an end to the war between Nikomedes and his father, but it was evidently not a legation of the same consequence as the decemvirate sent in 154. Three men served on the commission, a triumvirate that became more significant for the proverbial jest it elicited from Cato than for anything positive it achieved. The sources for this war are very sketchy, but it seems clear that the Roman attempt at mediation, halfhearted as it was, failed. Nikomedes defeated his father in battle and put him to death before ascending the throne himself (Diod. 32.21).

149. Metellus arbitrates between Thebes and various states (147)

Pausanias 7.14.7.

Ἐαλώκεcαν δὲ οἱ Θηβαῖοι πρώτην δίκην Μετέλλου δικάζοντος Φωκεῦcιν ἐκτῖcαι ζημίαν, ὅτι ἐcέβαλον cὺν ὅπλοις ἐc γῆν τὴν Φωκίδα, δευτέραν Εὐβοεῦcιν, ἐδήωcαν γὰρ καὶ Εὐβοέων τὴν χώραν, τρίτην δὲ Ἀμφιccεῦcι, τεμόντες καὶ τὴν Ἀμφιccέων περὶ ἀκμὴν cίτου.

1. *OGIS* 327, cited in **142**.

ἀφίκοντο, καὶ προσέταccον αὐτοῖς τὸν πόλεμον ἐκλῦcαι, Νικομήδους δὲ καὶ Ἀττάλου cυγχωρεῖν ὑποκρινομένων οἱ Βιθυνοὶ διδαχθέντες ἔλεγον οὐκ εἶναι δυνατοὶ φέρειν ἔτι τὴν ὠμότητα τὴν Προυσίου, φανεροὶ μάλιcτα αὐτῷ γενόμενοι δυcχεραίνοντες. οἱ μὲν δὴ πρέcβεις, ὡς οὔπω Ῥωμαίων τάδε πυθομένων, ἐπανῄεcαν ἄπρακτοι.

III: Livy *Periocha* 50

Prusias rex Bithyniae, omnium humillimorumque vitiorum, a Nicomede filio, adiuvante Attalo rege Pergami, occisus. . . . cum III legati ad pacem inter Nicomeden et Prusiam faciendam ab Romanis missi essent, cum unus ex his multis cicatricibus sartum caput haberet, alter pedibus aeger esset, tertius ingenio socors haberetur, M. Cato dixit eam in legationem, nec caput nec pedes nec cor habere.

Shortly after Prousias II's war against Attalos II was brought to an end through Roman mediation (**142**), Prousias found himself at war with his own son Nikomedes. Attalos joined with the Bithynian prince in the effort to dethrone his father. This action constituted a revolt on the part of Nikomedes, and aggression on the part of Attalos; it is interesting to see that it is Prousias who is accused, in an inscription from Pergamon, of breaking the Roman-arranged treaty of 154.[1] At the time of that treaty, the Romans had acted to put a stop to war between Pergamon and Bithynia. Then it had been their friend Pergamon who was endangered. Now it was Prousias who was threatened and besieged in Nikomedeia. The senate sent a commission to put an end to the war between Nikomedes and his father, but it was evidently not a legation of the same consequence as the decemvirate sent in 154. Three men served on the commission, a triumvirate that became more significant for the proverbial jest it elicited from Cato than for anything positive it achieved. The sources for this war are very sketchy, but it seems clear that the Roman attempt at mediation, halfhearted as it was, failed. Nikomedes defeated his father in battle and put him to death before ascending the throne himself (Diod. 32.21).

149. Metellus arbitrates between Thebes and various states (147)

Pausanias 7.14.7.

Ἐαλώκεcαν δὲ οἱ Θηβαῖοι πρώτην δίκην Μετέλλου δικάζοντος Φωκεῦcιν ἐκτῖcαι ζημίαν, ὅτι ἐcέβαλον cὺν ὅπλοις ἐc γῆν τὴν Φωκίδα, δευτέραν Εὐβοεῦcιν, ἐδήωcαν γὰρ καὶ Εὐβοέων τὴν χώραν, τρίτην δὲ Ἀμφιccεῦcι, τεμόντες καὶ τὴν Ἀμφιccέων περὶ ἀκμὴν cίτου.

1. *OGIS* 327, cited in **142**.

In the winter of 147/6 the Achaians were seeking support outside the League for the upcoming conflict with Sparta and Rome. They found the Thebans ready to lend a hand, quite possibly the only Boiotians to do so.[1] Pausanias states that feelings in Thebes were anti-Roman at the time because of a recent arbitration carried out by the Roman commander in Macedon, Q. Caecilius Metellus. In each of three instances, Metellus had ruled against the Thebans. All three suits had to do with Theban territorial aggressions. The Thebans had invaded Phokian and Euboian territory and had destroyed the harvest at Amphissa. These aggressions were all submitted to the arbitration of Metellus, at some point prior to the Theban decision to join Achaia in early 146, but doubtless after Metellus had accomplished his work in Macedon, perhaps as late as spring 147.[2]

The incidents do not appear to have been serious enough to have captured the attention of the contemporary chronicler Polybios. They scarcely seem important enough for Metellus to have interested himself in them, even if he did hold a "watching brief" for affairs in Greece.[3] Intervention by Metellus in Greece seems to have been restricted to more serious matters, such as the dispute between Sparta and Achaia (**147**). But Metellus's attention may have been drawn to the aggressive and troublesome, and perhaps pro-Achaian, activities of Thebes. He may have decided that Thebes needed taking down, and chose this method to do it. Metellus, however, had no official status within Greece itself. He was the Roman commander in Macedon, and hence the nearest representative of Rome in the Balkans, but he had no legal authority whereby he could summarily judge Greek disputes and enforce his decision. Thebes and the others must have turned to him voluntarily. Perhaps he offered his services initially; what is more likely is that representatives from Phokis, Euboia, and Amphissa approached him first, and Thebes followed to defend itself soon after. Given the penchant the Greek states had for submitting their disputes to the nearest prestigious individual, this seems to be the most reasonable scenario.[4]

150. Mummius arbitrates between Sparta and Messene (?) (146/5)

I: Tacitus *Annales* 4.43.3 (cf. **50**).
II: *IOlympia* 52.52–55 and 63–66 (cited in full in **159**).

See **50** and **159** for further bibliography.

1. E. S. Gruen, *JHS* 96 (1976) p. 68.
2. See M. G. Morgan, *Historia* 18 (1969) pp. 422–46.
3. Morgan, p. 433.
4. Cf. **76**, **98**, **99**, **152**.

In the winter of 147/6 the Achaians were seeking support outside the League for the upcoming conflict with Sparta and Rome. They found the Thebans ready to lend a hand, quite possibly the only Boiotians to do so.[1] Pausanias states that feelings in Thebes were anti-Roman at the time because of a recent arbitration carried out by the Roman commander in Macedon, Q. Caecilius Metellus. In each of three instances, Metellus had ruled against the Thebans. All three suits had to do with Theban territorial aggressions. The Thebans had invaded Phokian and Euboian territory and had destroyed the harvest at Amphissa. These aggressions were all submitted to the arbitration of Metellus, at some point prior to the Theban decision to join Achaia in early 146, but doubtless after Metellus had accomplished his work in Macedon, perhaps as late as spring 147.[2]

The incidents do not appear to have been serious enough to have captured the attention of the contemporary chronicler Polybios. They scarcely seem important enough for Metellus to have interested himself in them, even if he did hold a "watching brief" for affairs in Greece.[3] Intervention by Metellus in Greece seems to have been restricted to more serious matters, such as the dispute between Sparta and Achaia (**147**). But Metellus's attention may have been drawn to the aggressive and troublesome, and perhaps pro-Achaian, activities of Thebes. He may have decided that Thebes needed taking down, and chose this method to do it. Metellus, however, had no official status within Greece itself. He was the Roman commander in Macedon, and hence the nearest representative of Rome in the Balkans, but he had no legal authority whereby he could summarily judge Greek disputes and enforce his decision. Thebes and the others must have turned to him voluntarily. Perhaps he offered his services initially; what is more likely is that representatives from Phokis, Euboia, and Amphissa approached him first, and Thebes followed to defend itself soon after. Given the penchant the Greek states had for submitting their disputes to the nearest prestigious individual, this seems to be the most reasonable scenario.[4]

150. Mummius arbitrates between Sparta and Messene (?) (146/5)

I: Tacitus *Annales* 4.43.3 (cf. **50**).
II: *IOlympia* 52.52–55 and 63–66 (cited in full in **159**).

See **50** and **159** for further bibliography.

1. E. S. Gruen, *JHS* 96 (1976) p. 68.
2. See M. G. Morgan, *Historia* 18 (1969) pp. 422–46.
3. Morgan, p. 433.
4. Cf. **76**, **98**, **99**, **152**.

I: Tacitus *Annales* 4.43.3

Idem regis Antigoni, idem imperatoris Mummii iudicium; sic Milesios permisso publice arbitrio, postremo Atidium Geminum praetorem Achaiae decrevisse.

II: The Olympia inscription

[ὁπο]-
τεροι ταύτην τὴν χώραν κατεῖχ[ον ὅτε Λεύκιος]
Μόμμιος ὕπατος ἢ ἀνθύπατος [ἐν ἐκείνηι τῆι ἐπαρ]-
χείαι ἐγένετο, ὅπως οὗτοι οὕτ[ως κατέχωσιν] ...

... ἐκρίθη κατεισχῆσθαι ἡ χώρα ὑπὸ Μεσσ[η]νίων ὅτε
Λεύκιος Μόμμιος ὕπατος ἢ ἀνθύπατος [ἐ]ν ἐκεί-
νηι τῆι ἐπαρχείαι ἐγένετο, καὶ ὅπως οὕτ[οι] οὕτως
κατέχωσιν.

As with many other centuries-long disputes between neighbouring Greek states, the issue of the Dentheliatis was finally submitted to Roman judgement. Philip II had ruled on the matter in 338/7 after the battle of Chaironeia, and Antigonos Doson perhaps after Sellasia; Lucius Mummius followed suit by handing down his decision on it in 146 after the destruction of Corinth.[1] Sparta and Messene had long disputed the ownership of this region. Mummius, as the conquerors Philip and Antigonos before him had done, may have awarded the land to Messene. Strictly speaking, his judgement may not have been a formal arbitration but rather part of his settlement of Greece after the defeat of the Achaian League.[2] His action is recorded by Tacitus in a list of arbitrations on the matter, but it is not referred to as such in the almost contemporary Olympia inscription.[3]

The basis of Mummius's decision was probably the same as that laid down as a general rule by the Roman senate in their request to the Milesians to form an arbitral court to decide the issue less than ten years later (**159**). The criterion for ownership of the land was to be its status at the time when Mummius conquered Greece; whoever owned the land at that time was to be the lawful owner.[4] The question of ownership was to be determined by Roman politics rather than the legal-historical background of the land.

But Mummius's decision was open to challenge. Perhaps in the confusion reigning after the fall of Corinth, doubts could be raised about who had been

1. See Piccirilli 61; **50**.
2. See Roebuck, Diss., pp. 106–7.
3. It should be pointed out that Mummius's name appears in a context in the Olympia inscription that is not concerned to determine Mummius's own actions with respect to the Sparta-Messene affair.
4. Cf. **156**.

in actual possession of the land. Sparta may have made a move to occupy the territory and tried to use this occupation as grounds for an appeal made only a few years later.

151. Rome settles a dispute between Hermione and Troizen (?) (after 146?)

A brief inscription from Troizen discovered in 1899. H: 0.6 m; w: 1.1 m; d: 0.19 m.

P. Legrand, *BCH* 24 (1900) p. 200, no. 6; Fränkel, *IG* IV.791; *Hiller von Gaertringen, *IG* IV^2 1, p. xxvii.

Gruen, p. 738.

[Γ]ό[ργ]ιππον Ἐχ . . . . . ονα
εὐεργέταν ἃ πόλι[ς] ἀνέθη[κε]
ἀγορανομήσαντα καὶ πρε[σβεύ]-
σαντα εἰς Ῥώμαν ὑπὲρ φ[ιλίας καὶ]
5 συμμαχίας καὶ ὑπὲρ τᾶς [ὁμολογίας]
ποθ' Ἑρμιονεῖς ἐπτάκι[ς].

5: [εἰράνας]: Fränkel.

This little inscription from Troizen offers a concise and and unfortunately laconic bit of testimony for a Roman mediation between the states of Troizen and Hermione.[1] It honours one Gorgippos for his diplomatic efforts in Rome. As ambassador to Rome he worked to establish a relationship of friendship and alliance for Troizen. He also negotiated with the Romans concerning a peaceful agreement with Troizen's neighbour Hermione. The inscription tells us nothing more, but it is not unlikely that the Romans were willing to listen to embassies from Troizen and perhaps from Hermione as well.[2] Since Troizen, a member of the Achaian League until 146, was unlikely to have been sending independent embassies to Rome prior to that date to seek an alliance, or to ask Rome to arbitrate for that matter, this inscription should be dated to the years after 146, a time when Rome was requested to settle numerous outstanding disputes.[3]

1. Fränkel connected this inscription with *IG* IV.752, but the latter inscription has since proved to pertain to an arbitration between Arsinoë and Troizen (**138**).

2. As they listened to ambassadors from Melitaia and Narthakion (**156**) and from Samos and Priene (**160**).

3. See Gruen, p. 738. For the cluster of arbitration requests to Rome in the years after the destruction of Corinth, see **156**, **159**, **160**.

in actual possession of the land. Sparta may have made a move to occupy the territory and tried to use this occupation as grounds for an appeal made only a few years later.

151. Rome settles a dispute between Hermione and Troizen (?) (after 146?)

A brief inscription from Troizen discovered in 1899. H: 0.6 m; w: 1.1 m; d: 0.19 m.

P. Legrand, *BCH* 24 (1900) p. 200, no. 6; Fränkel, *IG* IV.791; *Hiller von Gaertringen, *IG* IV^2 1, p. xxvii.

Gruen, p. 738.

[Γ]ό[ργ]ιππον Ἐχ . . . . . ονα
εὐεργέταν ἃ πόλι[ς] ἀνέθη[κε]
ἀγορανομήσαντα καὶ πρε[σβεύ]-
σαντα εἰς Ῥώμαν ὑπὲρ φ[ιλίας καὶ]
5 συμμαχίας καὶ ὑπὲρ τᾶς [ὁμολογίας]
ποθ' Ἑρμιονεῖς ἐπτάκι[ς].

5: [εἰράνας]: Fränkel.

This little inscription from Troizen offers a concise and and unfortunately laconic bit of testimony for a Roman mediation between the states of Troizen and Hermione.[1] It honours one Gorgippos for his diplomatic efforts in Rome. As ambassador to Rome he worked to establish a relationship of friendship and alliance for Troizen. He also negotiated with the Romans concerning a peaceful agreement with Troizen's neighbour Hermione. The inscription tells us nothing more, but it is not unlikely that the Romans were willing to listen to embassies from Troizen and perhaps from Hermione as well.[2] Since Troizen, a member of the Achaian League until 146, was unlikely to have been sending independent embassies to Rome prior to that date to seek an alliance, or to ask Rome to arbitrate for that matter, this inscription should be dated to the years after 146, a time when Rome was requested to settle numerous outstanding disputes.[3]

1. Fränkel connected this inscription with *IG* IV.752, but the latter inscription has since proved to pertain to an arbitration between Arsinoë and Troizen (**138**).

2. As they listened to ambassadors from Melitaia and Narthakion (**156**) and from Samos and Priene (**160**).

3. See Gruen, p. 738. For the cluster of arbitration requests to Rome in the years after the destruction of Corinth, see **156**, **159**, **160**.

152. Mummius arbitrates between Argos and Kleonai (?) (145)

A limestone fragment found at Nemea. H: 0.27 m; w: 0.26 m; d: 0.13 m.

*D. W. Bradeen, *Hesperia* 35 (1966) pp. 326–29, no. 7; *SEG* XXIII.180.

- - - - - . . . . . α . ας Δα- - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - . . . . . στοκράτη Δαμ- - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - . ς Φάηνον Θιοδέκτα Ἀρ- - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - -μοκράτεος Ἰκετῖνον Ἰκε- - - - - - - - -
[- - - - - Φ]αίνανδρον Χάρμιος ᵛᵛ ε- - - - - - - - -
[- - - τῶν ἐν Ν]εμέαι ἀγώνων καὶ περὶ - - - - - - - -
- - - - - . . ν ἑκατέροις θεωρωσύν- - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - . . υ καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα Ἀργειο- - - - - - - - -
- - - - - . . . ιτήσεις ἐν ἑαυτοῖς γ- - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - . . . Λεύκιον Μόμμιον ἀνθύ[πατον - - - - - -]
- - - - - . . . τῶν δέκα πρεσβευτῶ[ν - - - - - - - -]
[- - - - - . . το]ὺς νόμους γεγονότα[ς - - - - - - - -]
- - - - - . . . Λευκίου Μομμίου ἀν[θυπάτου - - - - - -]
[- - - - - . . Ἀργ]είους κατευχηΙ- - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - . . . ΩΝΑΣΤΕΡΟΙ- - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - . . . . ναι ὅθεν λυς- ˥ - - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - . . . . ιτην τε- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - . . . . . - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Suggested restorations (Bradeen): 2: [Ἀρι]στοκράτη. || 9: [δια]ιτήσεις. || 15: [ἀγ]ῶνα στε[φανίτην].

Although only a fragment of this inscription remains, the context is clearly that of the organization of Greece by Mummius and the decemvirate after the Roman victory in 146. In 145 Mummius was proconsul (ἀνθύπατος) in Greece; at that time he and his associates undoubtedly carried out a variety of other judgements for which we have no remaining evidence.[1] In the present case, the dispute was an old one: that of Argos and Kleonai over the Nemean Games.[2] What Mummius's solution was is unknown. Bradeen suggests that the details of the settlement may have been left up to local arbitration (line 9). This would be in keeping with the typical Roman policy of not troubling themselves overmuch with the details of arbitration. In Greece in 196 and in Asia in 188 the Romans resolved some problems themselves but left others to the arbitration of other Greek states.[3] No doubt Mummius and those working with him took a similar approach.

1. He may have judged the long-standing Messene-Sparta dispute (**150**).
2. Cf. **44**.
3. See **76**, **98**.

153. Makon of Larisa arbitrates between Halos and Phthiotic Thebes (between c. 145 and 137)

Six fragments of a stele discovered at Delphi. Dimensions of the preserved text: h: 1.04 m; w: 0.68 m; d: 0.16 m.

M. Laurent, *BCH* 25 (1901) pp. 347–54, no. 3; Kern, *IG* IX.2 *add.* no. 205 I; *Pouilloux, *FDelphes* III.4 (1976) 355; Daverio Rocchi 14 (lines 25–29).

Raeder 72; Tod 40; Pomtow, *Klio* 18 (1923) p. 263, VI; Stählin, p. 180; L. Robert, *BCH* 59 (1935) pp. 208–9; J. Bousquet, *BCH* 101 (1977) 456–58; *SEG* XXVII.79; G. Daux, *BCH* 102 (1978) pp. 605–7, 614–18; H. Kramolisch, *Die Strategen des thessalischen Bundes* (Bonn, 1978) pp. 64–65; *SEG* XXVIII.471; G. Daux, *BCH* 103 (1979) pp. 471–75; id., *ZPE* 36 (1979) pp. 139–44; Robert, *REG* 1979, 219; *SEG* XXIX.460; Robert, *REG* 1980, 269; Thür, pp. 474, 483; Daverio Rocchi, pp. 152–55; H. Reinder Reinders, *New Halos* (Utrecht, 1988) pp. 152–54, 175.

. . . . εἰλο[υ], Ζώϊλος Τιμασιθέου, Ἀ[φ]θόνητος Ἀγήτορος καὶ τῶ[μ πολιτᾶν]
[. . . .Τιμ?]ασιθέου, Μνασίθεος Ἰσχομάχου, Φιλόμβροτος Αἴθωνος, Σιμά[δας . . .]
. . . . Δεινία, Φιλόμβροτος Δεινομάχου, Νικομένης Ἐπαρμόστου, Ἐ . . . . . .
[. . . . Τι]μασίθεος Βίωνος, Φίλιππος Λυσιμάχου, Τιμοκράτης Κατας . . . . .
. . . . εριναιος Ἀντιγόνου, Θεόμναστος Παρμενίωνος, Κρατησίμαχο[ς . . . .]
. . . . . νικος Ἁρμοξένου, Ἄσανδρος Λυσικλέα, Καλλίστρατος Ἀψεύδων[ος . . .]
. . . . ν καὶ οἱ ἀποταγέντες Δαμάρετος Ἀριστοβούλου, καὶ οἱ ταγοὶ Δα . . .
[. . . –. Δ]αμοτίωνος, Ξενόφιλος Βίωνος, καὶ τῶμ πολιτᾶν Μελάνθιος Ὄπλωνος, Ε . . . .
. . . . ανδρου, Σωσιγένης Δαμαρέτου, Κύναγος Δαμοτίωνος, Βίων Δαμοτίωνος, ...
. . . . Δαμοτίωνος, Φιλόμηλος Δαμοτίωνος, ἐκόντες αὐτοὶ ποθ' ἑαυτοὺς ὥστε π̣[ερὶ τᾶς]
[ἀμφιλ]εγομένας χώρας αὐταῖς ποθ' ἑαυτὰς ταῖς πόλεσι κριθῆμεν ἐν διαιτῷ Μ[άκωνι Ὀμ]-
[φαλίω]νος Λαρισαίωι καὶ τὰ κριθέντα ὑπὸ τούτου κύρια εἶμεν· κριθῆμεν δ' ἐμ μ̣[ηνὶ]
[ἐνάτω]ι, ὡς Θεσσαλοὶ ἄγοντι Θύωι, στρ[α]τ[η]γοῦντος τοῦ αὐτοῦ· τὰν δὲ συν[θήκαν]
[κατὰ] τὰν ἀποδοθεῖσαν κρίσιν ὑπὸ Μ[άκ]ωνος ἀναγραφεῖσαν ἐγ κίονας δύο, ἀ[ναθέ]-
[μεν τὰμ] μὲν μίαν ἐν Δελφοῖς, τὰν δὲ [ἄλ]λαν ἐν Λαρίσαι ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τοῦ Ἀπόλ[λωνος]

[τοῦ Κερδ]ώιου ἐν τῷ καταλειπομέν[ῳ] χρόνῳ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ· τὰς δὲ γινομέν[ας δαπά]-
[νας εἰς τα]ῦτα δόμεν ἑκατέραν τὰ[ν π]όλιν κατὰ τὸ ἥμισυ· ὁπότεροι δέ κα μὴ [ἀποδέχων]-
[ται τὰν] κρίσιν ἢ τοῖς κριθέντοις [ὑπ]ὸ Μάκωνος μὴ ἐμμείνωντι, ἀποτεισά-τω[σαν τᾶι]
[τε ἑτέραι π]όλει ἀργυρίου τάλαντα πέντε, καὶ χωρὶς τὰ κριθέντα ὑπὸ Μά-κ[ωνος]
- - - - - - - - ταῦτα ἀναγράψαντες εἰς κίονας δύο ἀναθέτωσαν ἑκ[άτεραι]
[αἱ πόλεις τὰμ μὲ]ν ἐν Θήβαις ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τᾶς Ἀθανᾶς τᾶς Πολιάδος, τὰν [δὲ ἐν Ἄλωι]
[τᾶι Ἀχα]ικᾶι ἐ[ν τῶι ἱερῶ]ι τᾶς Ἀρτέμιδος τᾶς Παναχαίας· Ξενοδόκοι Κεφαλ[ίων . . .]
[. . . . . Μ]ελιννα[ι . . . . . .]c, Νικ[ό]βουλος Περδίκκα, Πολυσάων Πολίτα, Μ[ελιταιεῖς].
[στρατ]αγέοντος Δι[οτίμου τοῦ Ἑρ]μία Λαρισαίου, μηνὸς ἐμβολίμου εἰκάδι, c- - - -
[διαιτητ]ὴς ὑπό τε τῆ[c Θηβαίων π]όλεως καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς Ἁλέων, Μάκων Ὀμ-φαλ[ίωνος Λαρι]-
[καῖος] περὶ τῆς χώρας ἧς [ἀμφελέγοντ]ο πρὸς αὐτοὺς οἵ τε Θηβαῖοι καὶ Ἁλεῖς, [περιοδεύσας]
[πᾶσαν τὴν χ]ώραν μετὰ τῶν ἀ[πεσταλμ]ένων ὑφ' ἑκατέρας τῆς πόλεως κ[αὶ διακού]-
[σας τοῦ ὑπ'] ἀμφοτέρων ῥηθέν[τος μαρτυρ]ίου ᾧ ἔκρινεν, ἑκατέρων εὐδοκε[όντων]
[περὶ τᾶς] μὲν ἱερᾶς χώρας ἀ- - - - - -ιοις προσοροῦσιν Λιγυναίοις· [ὅρια δ' εἶναι ὡς]
- - - - - ἀνέχουσιν ἐπὶ τ- - - - - - - - παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν τὴν ἀκρ- - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - -ων κατω[- - - - - ὥσπερ οἱ τέρ]μονες [ἔχ]ουσιν ἐ[πι- - - - - - -]
- - - - - - - - - -δρωι Α- -
- - - - - - - - - -οντο- - - - - - - - - - - - - -ο τούτου ἐπὶ - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - -μ- - - - - - - - - - - - - -ων κεῖται καὶ ἀπο- - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - -θ- - - - - - - - - - - - - -ας καὶ ταύτην τὴν- - - - - -
[- -τῆ]c χώρας ὑπάρχει ὅριο[ν - - - -]
- - - - - - - - - - -ο[- - - - - - ὥσπερ οἱ τέρμ]ονες οἱ πρῶτοι καὶ ἀπὸ το[ῦ]
- - - - - - - - - - -ε[- - - - - - -ct]ρεφον δί ἀνταίαν ἕως τῆς ὁ[δοῦ - - - - -]
[- x]αὶ ἀπὸ τῶν τερμόνων τῶι ορ- - - - -
[- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - θάλ]ασσαν· ἐξεῖναι δὲ ἑκατέροι[c - - - - - - - -]
- - - - - - - -ραν καὶ ει[- - - - - - - - μι]cθοῦ αὐτοῖς, ἑτέροις δὲ ἐγδιδ[όναι καὶ]
[οὐ κατ'] ἰδίαν ἀλλὰ κοινῆι [- - - - - - - - - - π]ωλεῖν ἐν ᾧ καιρῷ τάξω[cιν αὐταὶ]
[καὶ] ἀπὸ τῶν προσόδων c[υντελεῖν τ]ὰς θυσίας τοῖς θεοῖς, ἐάν τε κο[ινῆι ἔχωσιν]
[ἀμφότ]εραι αἱ πόλεις, ἐὰν τε διελόμενοι [τὰ π]ροσόδια καθ' ἰδίαν ἑκάτερ[οι ἔχωσι, τὰς δὲ]

- - - - τὰc ἐκ τούτων κειμένας ὑφ' ἑκατέρων ν[έ]μεν [ἐξ]εῖναι· τὸ δὲ κρῖμα τ[οῦτο ἑκάτε]-
[ροι] ἀναγραψάτωcαν εἰc κίονας λιθίνας τέccαραc καὶ ἀ[να]θέτωcαν μ[ίαν μὲν ἐν]
[Δελφ]οῖc, μίαν δὲ ἐν Λαρίcηι ἐν τῶι ἱερῶι τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνοc τοῦ Κερδώιου, μ[ίαν δὲ ἐν Θή]-
[βαιc ἐν] τῶι ἱερῶι τῆc Ἀθανᾶc τῆc Πολίαδοc, μίαν δὲ ἐν Ἀλῶι ἐν τῶι ἱε[ρῶι τῆc Ἀρτέ]-
[μιδο]c τῆc Παναχαίαc καὶ τοῦτο ποιηcάτωcαν ἐν τῶι ἔτει τῶι μ[ετὰ cτρατη]-
[γὸν Διό]τιμον· τὸ δὲ ἀνάλωμα εἰc ταῦτα δότωcαν ἑκάτεραι αἱ π[όλεις].

In 1976 Pouilloux pointed out that another small fragment had been recognized by J. Bousquet (in 1966) as belonging to this inscription. Pouilloux failed, however, to incorporate this fragment in his own edition (*FDelphes*). Following is Bousquet's restitution of the additional fragment, which provides a new reading of lines 42–50 (*BCH* 101; *SEG* XXVII.79):

ἂν καιρῶι τάξω[cιν] ἑ[κάτε]-
[ροι, καὶ] ἀπὸ τῶν προcόδων c[υντελεῖν τ]ὰc θυcίαc τοῖc θεοῖc, ἐάν τε κο[ινῆι] αἱρ[ῶν]-
[ται, ἀμφότ]εραι αἱ πόλεις, ἐὰν τε διελόμενοι [τὰ π]ροcόδια καθ' ἰδίαν ἑκά-
τερ[οι θ]ύειν, [τὰc]
[δὲ ζημίαc?] τὰc ἐκ τούτων κειμένας ὑφ' ἑκατέρων ἡρμέν[α]c εἶναι· τὸ δὲ κρῖμα τὸ ὑπὲρ τῆ[c]
[χώραc] ἀναγραψάτωcαν εἰc κίονας λιθίνας τέccαραc καὶ ἀ[να]θέτωcαν μίαν μὲν
[ἐν Δελφ]οῖc, μίαν δὲ ἐν Λαρίcῃ ἐν τῶι ἱερῶι τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνοc τοῦ Κερδώιου, μίαν δὲ ἐν
[Θήβαιc ἐν] τῶι ἱερῶι τῆc Ἀθηνᾶc τῆc Πολίαδοc, μίαν δὲ ἐν Ἀλῶι ἐν τῶι ἱ[ε]ρῶι τῆc
[Ἀρτέμιδο]c τῆc Παναχαίαc, καὶ τοῦτο ποιηcάτωcαν ἐν τῶι ἔτει τῶι με[τ]ὰ cτ[ρα]-
[τηγὸν Διό]τιμον· τὸ δὲ ἀνάλωμα τὸ εἰc ταῦτα δότωcαν ἑκάτεραι αἱ πό[λεις].

Wilamowitz (*ap.* Kern) suggested the following as a possible opening: [τάδε cυνέθεντο Θηβαίων οἱ ταγοὶ - -]. || 1: τῶ[μ πολιτᾶν?]: Laurent. || 2: Cιμά[δαc Ξανθία: Bousquet. || 4: Καταcτ[άcιοc]: Daux. || 5: . . ρριναιοc: Laurent. [Εἰ]ρ[η]ναῖοc?: Kern-Hiller von Gaertringen. [Εἰ]ρηναῖοc: Bousquet. [Ε]ἰρηναῖοc: Daux. || 7: οἱ ταγοὶ [Ἀλέων]: Kern. || 10: ⟨ἥ⟩κοντεc?: Bousquet. || 11: [ἀμφιλ]εγομένηc: Laurent. || 11–12: ἐν διαιτώμ[ατι τῶι| Μάκω]νοc Λαριcαίωι: Laurent (Laurent's majuscule text reads ΛΑΡΙΣΑΙΩΚΑΙ). ἐνδιαιτωμ[ένου| Μάκω]νοc Λαριcαίω: Kern-Hiller von Gaertringen. On the question of the iota subscript, and the relations of the words in lines 11–12, see Daux, *BCH* 102. || 12–13: ἐμ [μηνὶ ἐμ|βολίμω]ι: Kern, Daux. μῆ[νι]: Bousquet. || 13: ὡc ⟨δὲ⟩ Θεccαλοὶ: Kern-Hiller von Gaertringen. cτρ[α]τ[α]γοῦντοc: Kern. || 14: [τάνδε καὶ] τὰν: Kern. || 14–15: ἀ[ναθεῖ|ναι τὰν]: Laurent. ||

17: ἥμυcυ: Bousquet. || 17–18: [ἀποδέχω|νται]: Laurent. || 18: μὴ ἐμμένωντι: Laurent, Kern. || 18–19: [μὲν| τῆι ἑτέραι π]όλει: Laurent. || 19–20: ὑπὸ Μάκ[ωνος κα|ὶ τὰ ἐπιτιμήματα]: Laurent. ὑπὸ Μάκ[ωνος· τὰ| δὲ . .]: Kern. || 20–21: ἐκ[ατέρας| τὰς κίονας, τὴν μὲ]ν ἐν Θήβαις: Laurent. || 21: [τὰν μὲ]ν ἐν Θήβαις: Kern. || 22: [τᾶι Ἀχαϊ]ικᾶι: Kern. || 22–23: Κεφαλῦ[ος| Μ]ελίνν[ου Ἀλε]ύς: Bousquet. || 23: [Π]ελινν[αιεὺς]: Laurent. [Π]ελινν[αίου Ἀλεῖ]ς: Kern-Wilamowitz. || 23: Μ[ελιταιεῖ]: Laurent. || 24: [Στρατη]γέοντος Δ[ημοτίμου]: Laurent. Δ[αμοτίμου]: Kern. Δι[οτίμου τοῦ Ἑρμ]ία: Pomtow. εἰκαδι, c[υγκληθεὶc?]: Laurent. || 26–27: [περιπορευcά|μενος]: Laurent. || 28: ῥηθέν[τος κριτηρ]ίου δ ἔκρινεν: Laurent. ῥηθέν[τος μαρτυρ]ίου, δ ἔκρινεν: Kern. ῥηθέν[τα, ἐμ μην]ὶ Θύῳ or [τῶν] ῥηθέν[των]: Daux. εὐδοκ[ούντων ἀπέφηνε·]: Kern. εὐδοκη[cάντων]: Bousquet. || 29: [περὶ τῆc] μὲν ἱερᾶc χώρας ἀ[ποδοῦναι τ]οῖc προcοροῦcιν: Kern. –Ν οἷc προcοροῦcιν Λιγυναῖοι: Bousquet. [περὶ τῆc] μὲν ἱερᾶc χώρας, ἀ[πὸ gen. plur. ω]ν οἷc προcοροῦcιν Λιγυναι, ὅρ[ιον or ὅρ[ια]: Daux. || 29–30: [ὥcπερ| οἱ τέρμονες] ἔχουcιν: Laurent. [ὡc| οἱ τέρμονες] ἔχουcιν ἐπὶ . .: Kern. || 30: Ν ἔχουcιν: Bousquet. || 36: ὑπάρχειν ὅρια?: Laurent. ὑπάρχειν ὅριο[ν]: Kern. ὑπάρχειν: Bousquet. || 39: τῶ[ν] ὁρ[ιζόντων]: Kern. || 40: [τὴν θάλα]ccαν: Kern. || 42: [καθ'] ἰδίαν: Kern. ἐν ὧι ἂν καιρῶι: Laurent, Kern. || 44–45: [τὰc δὲ| χώρας]: Kern. || 50: [Δημό]τιμον: Laurent. [Δαμό]τιμον: Kern. τὸ δὲ ἀνάλωμα τὸ εἰc κτλ: Kern. ἀνήλωμα: Daux.

The two Thessalian communities of Halos and Phthiotic Thebes, both situated in eastern Achaia Phthiotis, had a territorial rivalry that centred on the plain situated between them. This rivalry, which resulted in the mid-second-century arbitration discussed here, may also have prompted the two states to seek a third-party settlement in the previous century.[1] The territory in dispute contained a sanctuary and land that was designated as sacred; the matter of religious jurisdiction over the sanctuary was therefore also in question. Halos and Thebes turned voluntarily (ἑκόντες) to a single individual to settle their differences. But his task was probably underwritten by the authority of the Thessalian federation; the appearance of federal magistrates in the inscription, the use of the federal calendar, and the presence of witness-guarantors from another Thessalian town, Melitaia (line 23), suggest some involvement on the part of the *koinon*.[2]

The inscription actually records two separate documents, a procedure that we occasionally find in publications of arbitral findings. Not only is the final judgement of Makon recorded (lines 24–50), but the original agreement to go to arbitration, the *compromissum*, is also here (lines 1–23). The *compromissum* was

1. See the inscription cited in **26** Appendix.

2. The Melitaian Polysaon was active around 150–145; a date of after 146 for this inscription is also supported by the appearance of the *tagoi*. See Pouilloux, p. 17; Kramolisch, pp. 64–65. For witnesses (μάρτυροι) as guarantors in other interstate agreements, cf. the role played by the Delphians in the treaty between Chaleion and Tritea (*IG* IX^2 1.739).

agreed on by representatives from both states, men whose names are listed in the first lines of the inscription as we have it. Thebes, whose citizens may be listed first, appears to have been the more prominent of the two states and seems to have been represented by a superior number.[3] The terms of the agreement called for the dispute to be submitted to one individual for adjudication, Makon, the son of Omphalion of Larisa. Such specification of a particular individual in an agreement to go to arbitration was unusual. Normal procedure was for the parties involved to decide on a mutually satisfactory third state; the appointment of individual judges would then become the duty of that state. Nevertheless, Makon appears to have been a prominent person, and the decision to choose him as an arbitrator may well have sprung from his reputation as an individual active in the Thessalian *koinon* as a whole.[4] Makon's decision was to be binding and was to take place within a set period of time; these provisions are common aspects of *compromissa*. In this case, since we also have the arbitral judgement, we can determine that the latter provision, at any rate, was adhered to.[5]

The *compromissum* also provided for the public inscription of the final decision of the arbitrator (lines 13–16). This was another common procedure involved in arriving at an arbitration agreement, a way of ensuring some security for the arbitrator's final judgement. According to the first document, there were to be two inscriptions of Makon's judgement set up, one at Delphi, a common venue for international agreements, and one in the temple of Apollo Kerdoios at Larisa; this publication was to take place within the year and the two sides were to share the cost equally.[6] The conclusion of the *compromissum* also refers to inscriptions that are to be set up both at Thebes, in the temple of Athena, and at Halos, in the temple of Artemis (lines 20–22).[7]

The judgement of Makon took place in the *strategia* of Diotimos, within the time limit set by the *compromissum*.[8] Makon made a tour of inspection of the disputed land in the presence of representatives from both sides, a common

3. See Reinders, pp. 175, 188.

4. *IG* IX.2.215 and 578 may refer to this Makon.

5. If either side refused to abide by Makon's binding arbitration, they were to be fined 5 silver talents.

6. Cf. **30**, **31**, **89**, **129**, **133**, **157**, **167** (Delphi); **70**, **12** Appendix, and **18** Appendix (the Larisan temple of Apollo Kerdoios).

7. The provision for publication follows on the regulation regarding fines for nonadherence to the points of Makon's arbitration; no doubt local copies of the arbitral judgement, as well as copies of the original *compromissum*, would serve as extra insurance. Daux (*ZPE* 36, pp. 139–40) appears to have confused the provisions for publication in the *compromissum*.

8. Kramolisch believes that Makon was strategos in the year in which Halos and Thebes turned to him for arbitration; this appears to be a misunderstanding of lines 12–13 (see Daux, *ZPE* 36, pp. 139f.).

function of an arbitrator.[9] Both sides had the opportunity to give evidence and argue their case before him prior to his decision on the delimitation of the territory.[10] In addition to settling the question of the land dispute, Makon made certain other rulings as well regarding the revenues of the sacred land and the shared costs of administering the sanctuary (lines 42–45). The end result of his arbitration seems to have been to confirm a joint control of the ἱερὰ χώρα, and to ensure that neither side exploited it for its own particular use. The record concludes with a restatement of the publication provisions: four copies in all were to be published, one in Delphi and one in each of the Thessalian towns concerned, Larisa, Halos, and Thebes.[11]

154. A multistate tribunal from Asia Minor arbitrates between Melitaia and Narthakion (c. 143?)

Two independent inscriptions provide testimonia for this arbitration.

I: The same inscription as **156** (q.v. for editions). The relevant portion is cited here.

II: Another inscription discovered in Thessaly, at Philia. H: 0.75 m; w: 1.08 m; d: 0.3 m. Two separate documents (A and B) are inscribed.

*N. Giannopoulos, *AE* 1927–28, pp. 119–27.

De Ruggiero, pp. 152–53; N. Giannopoulos, *AE* 1927–28, pp. 203f.; G. Klaffenbach, *AE,* 1927–28, pp. 205f.; Calabi, *Ricerche,* p. 118; A. McDevitt, *Inscriptions from Thessaly* (Hildesheim, 1970) 670; H. Kramolisch, *Die Strategen des thessalischen Bundes* (Bonn,1978) pp. 66f. For further bibliography see **156**, and cf. also **32** and **79**.

I: The Narthakion inscription

περί τε τούτων τῶν πραγμά-
[τω]ν ἔτει ἀνώτερον τρίτῳ ἐπὶ τριῶν δικασ-
[τη]ρίων νενικηκέναι, ἐπὶ Καμίων, Κολο[φ]ων[ί]-
[ων], Μαγνήτων, κεκ[ρι]μένα εἶναι κατὰ νόμου[ς],
ὅπως ταῦτα κύρια ᾖ οὕτως, καθὼς καὶ ἄλλοις
γεγονός ἐστιν·

9. Cf. **30**, **31**, **38**, **129**.

10. For a discussion of the topography of the territory in dispute, see Reinders, pp. 152f.

11. In all cases the inscriptions were to be set up in temples in the community: the Apollo temple at Larisa, the Athena temple at Thebes, and the Artemis temple at Halos. Cf. the arbitration inscriptions from the temple of Athena at Priene (**74**, **100**, **160**).

function of an arbitrator.[9] Both sides had the opportunity to give evidence and argue their case before him prior to his decision on the delimitation of the territory.[10] In addition to settling the question of the land dispute, Makon made certain other rulings as well regarding the revenues of the sacred land and the shared costs of administering the sanctuary (lines 42–45). The end result of his arbitration seems to have been to confirm a joint control of the ἱερὰ χώρα, and to ensure that neither side exploited it for its own particular use. The record concludes with a restatement of the publication provisions: four copies in all were to be published, one in Delphi and one in each of the Thessalian towns concerned, Larisa, Halos, and Thebes.[11]

154. A multistate tribunal from Asia Minor arbitrates between Melitaia and Narthakion (c. 143?)

Two independent inscriptions provide testimonia for this arbitration.

I: The same inscription as **156** (q.v. for editions). The relevant portion is cited here.

II: Another inscription discovered in Thessaly, at Philia. H: 0.75 m; w: 1.08 m; d: 0.3 m. Two separate documents (A and B) are inscribed.

*N. Giannopoulos, *AE* 1927–28, pp. 119–27.

De Ruggiero, pp. 152–53; N. Giannopoulos, *AE* 1927–28, pp. 203f.; G. Klaffenbach, *AE,* 1927–28, pp. 205f.; Calabi, *Ricerche,* p. 118; A. McDevitt, *Inscriptions from Thessaly* (Hildesheim, 1970) 670; H. Kramolisch, *Die Strategen des thessalischen Bundes* (Bonn,1978) pp. 66f. For further bibliography see **156**, and cf. also **32** and **79**.

I: The Narthakion inscription

περί τε τούτων τῶν πραγμά-
[τω]ν ἔτει ἀνώτερον τρίτῳ ἐπὶ τριῶν δικασ-
[τη]ρίων νενικηκέναι, ἐπὶ Καμίων, Κολο[φ]ων[ί]-
[ων], Μαγνήτων, κεκ[ρι]μένα εἶναι κατὰ νόμου[ς],
ὅπως ταῦτα κύρια ᾖ οὕτως, καθὼς καὶ ἄλλοις
γεγονός ἐστιν·

9. Cf. **30**, **31**, **38**, **129**.

10. For a discussion of the topography of the territory in dispute, see Reinders, pp. 152f.

11. In all cases the inscriptions were to be set up in temples in the community: the Apollo temple at Larisa, the Athena temple at Thebes, and the Artemis temple at Halos. Cf. the arbitration inscriptions from the temple of Athena at Priene (**74**, **100**, **160**).

II: The Philia inscription

A Στραταγέοντος τῶν Θεσσαλῶν . . . που τοῦ Ἀλεξίππου Λαρι-
caίου . . . θακος . . κ . . . . αι Γ?υριτέων Κλεοδίκου τοῦ Ἀμεινία, Μένη-
τος τοῦ Νικάτα, Πασιμάχου τοῦ Αἰσχρίωνος, τάδε ἀπεφήνατο
[οἱ ἀποστ]αλέντες δικασταὶ πρὸς τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Θεσσαλῶν ὑπὸ
μὲν τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Κολοφωνίων Διονύσιος Ἑρμασιάνακτος, Ἀ-
- - - - -αντων . . ὑπὸ δὲ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Σαμίων Νεπτόλεμος Ἡ-
[γησίου? Ζ]ώπυρος Ἀπατουρίου, ὑπὸ δὲ τοῦ Μαγνήτων δήμου Κύδι-
[ππος? - - - - -] Διαγόρας Ἰσαγόρου, περὶ τῶν παραγραφῶν τῶν ὑπογεγραμ-
[μένων.] στραταγέοντος τῶν Θεσσαλῶν Κρατεραίου τοῦ Διοδώρου
- - - - - - μηνὸς Λεσχανουρίου νουμηνίαι πόλις Μελιταιέων δίδω-
[σι - - - κατ?]ά τε τῶν συννέδρων Κλεονίκωι Μεννείου Λα-
[μιεῖ?] . . ἃ ὑπάρχειν ὅρια τὰς χώρας Παγῶν, ἄν{ν}ά ροὰ Κιβ-
- - - - - - - οὗ τιννος τὰ ὅρια ἔχοντι τὰ ποτὶ Λαμιεῖς ἐκ τᾶς Παραστοιχίδος,
- - - - - - - - - - - -νε Ἀθαμάνων? ἐκ τοῦ Πλαθάμου ἐν τὰν Συάλαν ἐπὶ τὸ
- - - - - -ΑΣΕΝΩΚΙΥΜΗΝαπαντα ἐπὶ τῶν τῆς Ἁλοεντος? ΕΠΟΥΘΑ- - - - - -
ΟΤΟΣΕΙΚΙΝ ἐκ τοῦ Ἀκονίεντος ἐπὶ τὰν Παγὰν τᾶι πόλει Μελιτααίων
- ἐπὶ τὸ Ἀρτέ[μιδος ἰε]-
[ρόν -]Ι [ὑ]πὸ Λαύτα[ς] τ[ῆ π]αγῶν
[- ἐ]κ τᾶς
- -ωνιων

1: τῶν Θεσσαλῶν [Ἱ]ππ[ο]λόχου: Klaffenbach.

B Μνιάδα καλεῖ με- - - - - - -
καὶ ἀπὸ ταύτας ἐν - - - - - -
Τούλαι, ἀπὸ δὲ τούτο[υ ἐν Κρυ]-
βέλαι ἐπεὶ τὰ ἀπὸ Γ[- - - - - ἐ]-
πιδιαβάντων δὲ τὸ
Δέρας, ἀπὸ δὲ ταῦτα [ἀ]-
πὸ τούτου ἐπὶ τὰν Κυ- - - -
ταὶ φέρουσαι ἐγ Λεαί[νας?]
ἐνορθον ἐπὶ τὰς Κάλ-
λας τὰς ὑπαρχούσας
Κομμάδα, τὰν οὖσαν ὕπ[ορ]-
θον ἐν τὰν Κρυβέλαν, [κα]-
ταλειπομένου τοῦ ἱερ[οῦ],
ὡς τὰς ἐπὶ τὸγ Χαρα[δρα]-
ῖον καὶ ἀπὸ τούτου ἐν τὰν
Περβίτα[ν]? ἐκ ταύτας ἐν - -
συγγραφομένων ἐν-
[τ]ὸς καὶ τῆς τῶν ἀκουό[ντων?]
κρίνοντες αὐτὰ ὑπάρ[χειν]
ὡ[ς] δὲ τῆς ἀναλήψεω[ς].
- - - -εια πίνακας δ' ἐν - - [ἐν]
κεφαλαίωτΣΥ . Ω . ΤΤ . Α
- - -EN- - - -E- - - - - - -

vacat

ἱεροὺς λόγο[υς? - - - - - -]
ὑπὲρ ἧς ποιν- - - - - - - - -
τῶν παρεγέν[οντο- - - - -]
ἔδωκαν οἱ Α- - - - - - - - - -
τὰς παρὰ [- - - - - - - παρ]-
αγενό[μενοι - - - - - - -]

1: μνειάδα καλειμέ[ναν]: Hiller von Gaertringen *ap.* Giannopoulos. || 4: ἔπειτα: Hiller von Gaertringen *ap.* Giannopoulos. || 6: ταύτα[ς]: Hiller von Gaertringen *ap.* Giannopoulos.

Around the middle of the second century the conflict between the Thessalian communities of Narthakion and Melitaia was once again taken to arbitration, this time to a tribunal of judges from Asia Minor.[1] That the solution arrived at by the Asian judges was ultimately a failure is evident from the fact that within three years Melitaian and Narthakian ambassadors were pleading their case in Rome (**156**). The evidence for the tribunal of judges from Asia Minor comes from two separate epigraphic sources. One is the inscription from Narthakion recording the decision of the Roman senate on the case of Narthakion and Melitaia (I). There we read that there had been a triple tribunal, consisting of judges from Samos, Kolophon, and Magnesia, in the third year before the Roman judgement. At that time the Narthakians (who were responsible for bringing the decision of the Asian Greeks to the attention of the Roman senate) had been victorious.

The other piece of evidence for the arbitration of the Samians and the rest is an inscription from Philia in Thessaly that was not immediately recognized as connected to this case. The Philia inscription contains two documents, the second of which is a boundary delineation (II B). The first document (II A) is less straightforward. It records the decision of certain judges who were dispatched to the Thessalian League in the *strategia* of the Larisan Hippolochos (II A, lines 1–9).[2] These judges were six in number, two each from Kolophon, Samos, and Magnesia. This in itself is enough to prompt us to look for connections between this inscription and the Narthakian one. The Melitaians then appear in a document dated by the Thessalian strategos Krateraios, perhaps the successor to Hippolochos (II A, lines 9f.).[3] The document appears to discuss the borders in detail but is unfortunately so fragmented as to offer no connected sense; at one point the Lamians are mentioned, a fact that led

1. See **32** and **79**.

2. Klaffenbach identified the Thessalian strategos, whose name is lacunose, with Hippolochos. Kramolisch (pp. 66f.) gives a lower limit for the *strategia* of Ἱππόλοχος Ἀλεξίππου Λαρισαῖος of 142/1 at the latest.

3. See Kramolisch, pp. 66f.

the original editor to conclude that the conflict was between the Lamians and the Melitaians. But it is equally possible that Lamia appears only in the role of a landmark, and that the other disputant was Melitaia's enduring opponent Narthakion.[4]

The six judges from Asia Minor were chosen and dispatched by the governments of their respective states (II A, lines 4f.). They had apparently been invited by the federal *koinon* of the Thessalians; the implication is that in this case at least the League did not become directly involved in arbitrating between its members but rather referred the matter outside the League entirely. Multiple tribunals, consisting of members from several different states, are precedented elsewhere.[5] It is not certain whether the Samian, Kolophonian, and Magnesian judges formed a single tribunal, or whether they constituted separate and autonomous commissions. The inscription from Philia gives no indication that the judges worked independently; but, on the other hand, the phrasing of the Narthakian inscription suggests that the tribunals were distinct.[6] Still, it seems reasonable to assume that a joint commission of six men was a more feasible solution than three separate commissions of two each. Perhaps the Narthakian claim in Rome that they had been favoured by "three tribunals" (rather than only one) was simply a deliberate misdirection to bolster their case.

155. Scipio Aemilianus in the East (144/3 or 140/39?)

I: Diodoros 33.28b.3–4.
II: Athenaios 273a (Polybios frag. 76BW; Poseidonios frag. 59 *FGH*).

Broughton, vol. 1, pp. 480–81; A. E. Astin, *Scipio Aemilianus* (Oxford, 1967) pp. 127, 138–39, 177; Gruen, pp. 280, 669–70, 714–15; Sherwin-White, p. 57; H. B. Mattingly, *CQ* 36 (1986) pp. 491–95.

I: Diodoros 33.28b.3–4

Καθόλου δὲ καὶ τὰ πλεῖστα μέρη τῆς οἰκουμένης ἐπῆλθον, καὶ παρὰ πᾶσι σώφρονα καὶ θαυμαστὴν ποιησάμενοι τὴν ἐπιδημίαν μεγάλης ἀποδοχῆς ἔτυχον, καὶ μετ' εὐφημίας ὑπὸ πάντων συμφωνουμένης ἐπανῆλθον. (4) τῶν γὰρ

4. Klaffenbach was responsible for making the original connection between the Philia inscription and *IG* IX.2.89.

5. Cf. **63** and **109**.

6. In **63**, it is also uncertain whether the Milesian and Rhodian judges formed separate tribunals; their findings are recorded separately, yet they are virtually identical.

the original editor to conclude that the conflict was between the Lamians and the Melitaians. But it is equally possible that Lamia appears only in the role of a landmark, and that the other disputant was Melitaia's enduring opponent Narthakion.[4]

The six judges from Asia Minor were chosen and dispatched by the governments of their respective states (II A, lines 4f.). They had apparently been invited by the federal *koinon* of the Thessalians; the implication is that in this case at least the League did not become directly involved in arbitrating between its members but rather referred the matter outside the League entirely. Multiple tribunals, consisting of members from several different states, are precedented elsewhere.[5] It is not certain whether the Samian, Kolophonian, and Magnesian judges formed a single tribunal, or whether they constituted separate and autonomous commissions. The inscription from Philia gives no indication that the judges worked independently; but, on the other hand, the phrasing of the Narthakian inscription suggests that the tribunals were distinct.[6] Still, it seems reasonable to assume that a joint commission of six men was a more feasible solution than three separate commissions of two each. Perhaps the Narthakian claim in Rome that they had been favoured by "three tribunals" (rather than only one) was simply a deliberate misdirection to bolster their case.

155. Scipio Aemilianus in the East (144/3 or 140/39?)

I: Diodoros 33.28b.3–4.
II: Athenaios 273a (Polybios frag. 76BW; Poseidonios frag. 59 *FGH*).

Broughton, vol. 1, pp. 480–81; A. E. Astin, *Scipio Aemilianus* (Oxford, 1967) pp. 127, 138–39, 177; Gruen, pp. 280, 669–70, 714–15; Sherwin-White, p. 57; H. B. Mattingly, *CQ* 36 (1986) pp. 491–95.

I: Diodoros 33.28b.3–4

Καθόλου δὲ καὶ τὰ πλεῖστα μέρη τῆς οἰκουμένης ἐπῆλθον, καὶ παρὰ πᾶσι σώφρονα καὶ θαυμαστὴν ποιησάμενοι τὴν ἐπιδημίαν μεγάλης ἀποδοχῆς ἔτυχον, καὶ μετ' εὐφημίας ὑπὸ πάντων συμφωνουμένης ἐπανῆλθον. (4) τῶν γὰρ

4. Klaffenbach was responsible for making the original connection between the Philia inscription and *IG* IX.2.89.

5. Cf. **63** and **109**.

6. In **63**, it is also uncertain whether the Milesian and Rhodian judges formed separate tribunals; their findings are recorded separately, yet they are virtually identical.

ἐχόντων τὰς ἀμφισβητήσεις οὓς μὲν διηλλάχεσαν ἀλλήλοις, οὓς δ' ἐπεπείκεσαν τὰ δίκαια ποιῆσαι τοῖς ἐγκαλοῦσι, τοὺς δὲ ἀναισχυντοῦντας διὰ τῆς ἀνάγκης κατεστάλκεσαν, τοὺς δὲ δυσδιακρίτους ἀνεπεπόμφεσαν ἐπὶ τὴν σύγκλητον. ὡμιληκότες δὲ βασιλεῦσι καὶ δήμοις καὶ τὴν προϋπάρχουσαν αὐτοῖς φιλίαν πρὸς ἅπαντας ἀνανεωσάμενοι πρὸς εὔνοιαν τὴν ἡγεμονίαν ἐπηύξησαν....

II: Athenaios 273a

Σκιπίων γοῦν ὁ Ἀφρικανὸς ἐπίκλην ἐκπεμπόμενος ὑπὸ τῆς συγκλήτου ἐπὶ τὸ καταστήσασθαι τὰς κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην βασιλείας, ἵνα τοῖς προσήκουσιν ἐγχειρισθῶσιν.... ὡς ἱστορεῖ Πολύβιος καὶ Ποσειδώνιος....

The Eastern embassy undertaken by Scipio Aemilianus and his colleagues sometime in the years after the Punic and Achaian wars was evidently a landmark mission; yet it is documented in only the vaguest of terms.[1] The details of the embassy's labours are largely unknown, and the brief or allusive references in the sources were often more interested in contrasting Roman virtue and Eastern vice than in offering a full account of the legates' activities. At the least, Aemilianus's embassy could be characterized as a tour of inspection, since the Romans are said to have gone to Egypt and the East in order to examine and observe.[2] Diodoros and others, however, recorded that the mandate of the embassy was more wide-ranging than simple investigation. The legates were to settle the disorders of the several kingdoms, restoring them to the lawful rulers. Furthermore, they were to mediate or arbitrate a variety of disputes, enforcing some of their own decisions, but passing on others to the senate for final judgement. The sources are vague, but they imply that the Romans settled disputes between the city-states as well as those that divided the monarchs of the day.

The mandate of this embassy, representative as it was of all the supreme Roman virtues, sounds suspiciously broad. The actions of Scipio and his colleagues call to mind the work of the decemvirates in Greece and the East after the Second Macedonian and Antiochene wars.[3] Such an embassy seems out of place in 140/39; if it did take place in this year, it seems more than likely that the amount of arbitral and mediatory work it carried out was greatly exaggerated by the tradition.

1. The traditional date of the embassy is 140/39; for the argument that it should be dated instead to 144/3, see Mattingly. For a list of the primary sources, see Broughton.

2. Diod. 33.28b.1: κατασκεψόμενοι τὴν ὅλην βασιλείαν; Strabo 669C: ἐπισκεψόμενον τὰ ἔθνη καὶ τὰς πόλεις; Plut. *Mor.* 220e: πόλεων ἐθνῶν βασιλέων ἐπίσκοπον; Justin 38.8.8: *ad inspicienda sociorum regna.*

3. Or the work of Alexander the Great, also credited with arbitrating the disputes of the civilized world (7).

156. The Roman senate arbitrates between Melitaia and Narthakion (c. 140?)

An inscription found near Limogardi in Thessaly, the site of ancient Narthakion. The stone is engraved on two of its sides (A and B). A: h: 0.67 m; w: 0.345 m. B: h: 0.68 m; w: 0.425 m. Cf. **32**, **79**, **154**.

B. Laticheff, *BCH* 6 (1882) pp. 356–87; Viereck, pp. 16–19, no. 12; de Ruggiero, pp. 251–55, no. 8; Berard 26; Dittenberger, *SIG*^{2} 307; Kern, *IG* IX.2.89; Dittenberger/Hiller von Gaertringen, *SIG*^{3} 674; Abbott/Johnson, pp. 258–61, no. 8; *Sherk 9; Daverio Rocchi 13.3 (lines 20–30).

P. Willems, *Le sénat de la république romaine* I (Louvain, 1878) pp. 708–14; H. G. Lolling, *MDAI(A)* 10 (1885) pp. 284–85; Sonne 28; A. Wilhelm, *GGA* 165 (1903) p. 795; Phillipson, p. 158; Raeder 19; Tod 34, p. 106; Lécrivain, p. 13; Stählin, pp. 188–89; G. Daux, *BCH* 57 (1933) pp. 96–97; F. Stählin, *Philologus* 88 (1933) pp. 130–32; S. Accame, *Il dominio romano* (Rome, 1946) pp. 69–70; Y. Béquignon, *BCH* 70 (1946) p. 14; N. Lewis/M. Reinhold, *Roman Civilization* I (New York, 1951) pp. 333–34, no. 133; Johnson et al., *ARS* 39; A. H. M. Jones, *A History of Rome* I (New York, 1968) pp. 76–78; Larsen, *GFS*, p. 288; H. Kramolisch, *Die Strategen des thessalischen Bundes* (Bonn, 1978) pp. 68–69; *SEG* XXVIII.505; Gruen, p. 105; Sherk, *TDGR*, pp. 37–38, no. 38; Daverio Rocchi, pp. 143–51; Ager, *AHB* 3.5 (1989) pp. 107–14.

A [Στρατ]ᾳγέοντος τῶν Θεσσαλῶν Λέοντο[ς]
[τοῦ Ἀγ]ησίππου Λαρισαίου, ἐν δὲ Ναρθακίω[ι]
[ταγευόν]των Κρίτωνος τοῦ Ἀμεινία, Πολυκλέος
[τοῦ Φει]δίππου, Γλαυκέτα τοῦ Ἀγελάου, ἀν[ε]-
[γράφη τὸ] δόγμα τὸ γενόμενον ὑπὸ συγκλ[ήτ]-
[του ἐπὶ σ]τρατηγοῦ τῶν Θεσσαλῶν Θεσσα-
[λοῦ τοῦ] Θρασυμήδεος Φεραίου. ᵛᵛ
[Γάϊος Ὁσ]τίλιος Αὔλου υἱὸς Μαγκῖνος στρα-
[τηγὸς τ]ῆι συγκλήτωι συνεβουλεύσατο πρὸ
[. . . . νω]νῶν Κοϊντιλίων ἐγ κομετίωι· γραφο-
[μένωι π]αρῆσαν Κοΐντος (C)τατιλιηνὸς Κοΐντου
[υἱὸς Κορ]νηλία, Γναῖος Λοτάτιος Γναίου υἱὸ[ς]
[Ἀ . . . . ήν]ση, Αὖλος Σεμπρώνιος Αὔλου υἱὸς Φα-
[λέρνα]. ᵛᵛ περὶ ὧν Θεσσαλοὶ Μελιταιεῖς Ἁρμό-
[ξενος Λυ]σάνδρου, Λαμπρόμαχος Πολίτα
[πρεσβευ]ταὶ λόγους ἐποιήσαντο, ἄνδρες κα-
[λοὶ κἀγα]θοὶ καὶ φίλοι παρὰ δήμου καλοῦ
[κἀγαθο]ῦ καὶ φίλου συμμάχου ⟨τε⟩, χάριτα
[φιλίαν σ]υμμαχίαν τε ἀνενεώσαντο, πε-
[ρὶ χώρας] δημοσίας καὶ περὶ χωρίου ἐρήμου
[εἴπασαν?], μεθ' ἧς χώρας εἰς τὴμ φιλίαν τοῦ
[δήμου τ]οῦ Ῥωμαίων ᵛᵛ παρεγένοντο, ἣγ χώ-

[ραν Ναρθα]χιεῖς μετὰ ταῦτα ἑαυτῶν ἀδίκως
[ἐποιήσαντ]ο, περὶ τούτου τοῦ πράγματος ὅπως
[τὴν διάνοι]αν πρόσ⟨σ⟩χωσιν, ὅπως τοῦτο τὸ πρᾶ-
[γμα ἀκέρα]ιον αὐτοῖς ἀποκατασταθῇ οὕτω
[καθὼς πρότερο]ν ἐπὶ Μηδείωι καὶ ἐπὶ Θεσσαλῶν
. . . . . ων καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν περὶ Πύλλον Μακε-
[δόνων κεκρι]μένον αὐτοῖς ἦν, ταῦτά τε τὰ κ[ρί]-
[ματα κύρια ὅπω]ς ᾖ· περὶ τούτου τοῦ πράγμα-
[τος συνευδόκ]ησεν ἡμῖν καὶ Ναρθακιεῦσιν
[ὅπως τὸν ἀγῶν]α τὸν παρόντα κρίνῃ ἐμ Μ[ελι]-
[τείαι? . . . . . ἐ]ν ταύτηι τῆι χώραι . . . . . .
[. . ἀμφοτέρων] τῶν δήμων ἐ[πιτρεπόντων]
. . . . . ἔστιν ὧι ρα- - - - - - - - - - - -
B - - - -ιη . . νη[- - καὶ περὶ ὧν Θεσσαλοὶ]
[Ναρθακιεῖς Ν]ικάτας Τα . . . . . .
[. . . . ., πρεσβε]υταὶ λόγο[υς] ἐπ[οιήσαντο κατὰ]
[πρόσωπον ἐν τῆι] συγκλήτ[ωι ἄνδρες καλοὶ
[κἀγα]θοὶ καὶ φίλοι παρὰ δήμου κ̣α̣[λοῦ κἀ]-
[γαθοῦ κα]ὶ φίλ[ου συμμάχου τε ἡμετέρου χά-
[ριτα φι]λίαν συ[μ]μ̣α̣[χίαν τε ἀνενεώσαντο καὶ
[περὶ τῶν πραγ]μάτω[ν τῶν καθ' αὑτοὺς διελέ-
[γ]ησαν περὶ χώρας [καὶ] ἱ[ε]ρ[ῶν περὶ τῆ]ς τ̣ε̣
ἀφ[ῃ]ρη[μένης] τ[ῆς κατὰ Μελιτ]α[ι]έ̣α̣ς̣ ἀ̣ρ̣χ̣ῆς Ναρ-
θακιέ[ω]ν [τῶν] ἐν τ[ῇ Ἀχαι]ί̣α[ι· καὶ γὰρ] μετὰ τα[ύτης]
τ[ῆ]ς χώρας εἰς τὴν [φ]ιλία[ν] τ[οῦ δή]μου [τοῦ Ῥω]-
[μ]αίω[ν] Ναρθακιεῖς παραγ[εγονέν]αι, [κ]α̣ὶ περὶ
τῆς χώρας καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν κριτηρίοις [νεν]ικηκ[έ]-
ναι κατὰ νόμους τοὺς Θεσσαλῶν, οἷς [νό]-
μοις ἕως τα[ν]ῦν χρῶν[τ]αι, οὓς νόμους Τίτος
Κοΐγκτιος ὕπατος ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν δέκα πρες-
βευτῶν γνώμης ἔδωκεν καὶ κατὰ δόγμα
συγκλήτου, περί τε τούτων τῶν πραγμά-
[τω]ν ἔτει ἀνώτερον τρίτῳ ἐπὶ τριῶν δικασ-
[τη]ρίων νενικηκέναι, ἐπὶ Σαμίων, Κολο[φ]ων[ί]-
[ων], Μαγνήτων, κεκ[ρι]μένα εἶναι κατὰ νόμου[ς,]
ὅπως ταῦτα κύρια ᾖ οὕτως, καθὼς καὶ ἄλλοις
γεγονός ἐστιν· περὶ τούτου τοῦ πράγματος
οὕτως ἔδοξεν· χάριτα φιλίαν συμμαχίαν
[ἀ]νανεώσασθαι τούτοις τε φιλανθρώπως ἀ-
ποκριθῆναι· ἄνδρας καλοὺς κἀγαθοὺς προσ-
αγορεῦσαι, ὅσα κεκριμένα ἐστὶν κατὰ νόμους
οὓς Τίτος Κοΐγκτιος ὕπατος ἔδωκεν, ταῦτα, κα-
θὼς κεκριμένα ἐστιν, οὕτω δοκεῖ κύρια εἶναι δεῖν·
τοῦτό τε μὴ εὐχερὲς εἶναι, ὅσα κατὰ νόμους κε-
κριμένα ἐστιν ἄκυρα ποιεῖν. ξενιά τε ἑκατέροις Γάϊ-
ος Ὀστίλιος στρατηγὸς τὸν ταμίαν δοῦναι κε-

[λ]εύςῃ ἀπὸ cηcτερτίων νόμων ἑκατὸν εἴκοcι
[πέ]γτε εἰc ἑκάcτην πρεcβείαν, οὕτω καθὼc ἂν
[αὐτῶι ἐκ] τῶν δημοcίων πραγμάτων πίcτε-
[ώc τε τῆc] ἰδίαc φαίνηται· ἔδο[ξ]εν. ᵛᵛ

3: [ἀρχόντ]ων: Laticheff, Viereck, de Ruggiero, Berard, Dittenberger, Kern, Hiller von Gaertringen, Abbott/Johnson. [ταγευόν]τ̣ων: Stählin, Accame, Kramolisch. || 4: [τοῦ Κυ]δίππου: Laticheff, Viereck, de Ruggiero, Berard, Dittenberger. [τοῦ Φει]δίππου: Lolling. || 9–10: προ|[τέραι νω]νῶν: Laticheff, Viereck, de Ruggiero, Berard. || 13: [Ἀνιήν]cη or [Ἀρνήν]cη: Dittenberger. || 20–21: ἐρήμου|[. . . . . o]υ: Kern. || 21: [διελέγηcαν]: Laticheff, Berard. [εἴπαcαν]: Wilamowitz *ap.* Viereck. || 26: [ὑπὸ Ῥωμαί?]ων: Laticheff, Viereck, de Ruggiero, Berard, Dittenberger. [ἀκέρα]ιον: Kern. || 27–28: Θεccαλῶν| [αὐτονομουμένω]ν: Laticheff, Berard. || 30: [κύρια αὐτοῖ]c ᾖ: Laticheff, Viereck, de Ruggiero, Berard, Dittenberger, Hiller von Gaertringen, Abbott/Johnson. [ὅπω]c ᾖ: Kern. || 34: ἐ[πιτρεπόντων]: Hiller von Gaertringen. || 39: ΠΟΛΥΚΛ rather than ΣΥΝΚΛΗ: Béquignon. || 44–46: Hiller von Gaertringen. || 45: φέρη: Laticheff, Berard. ἀφ[ηι]ρῆ[cθαι]: Viereck, de Ruggiero, Dittenberger, Kern. || 48: παραγ[ενέcθ]αι: Laticheff, Berard. || 49–50: κ[αὶ] τ[ρὶc νεν]ικη[κέ]|ναι: Wilamowitz *ap.* Viereck, de Ruggiero. κ[αὶ] π[ρ]ὶ[ν νεν]ικη[κέ]|ναι: Dittenberger. κ[αὶ] π[άλιν]: Sonne. Kern clearly read ΚΡΙΤΗΡΙΟΙΣ on the squeeze.

The eternal dispute between Narthakion and Melitaia was finally referred to the Roman senate for settlement around the year 140.[1] The choice of Rome as arbitrator at this stage is to be connected to the new position of Rome with respect to the Greek states. Ever since the Second Macedonian War Rome had been increasingly the focus of Greek requests for settlement of disputes; after the Roman victory of 146 this trend intensified. The Melitaians were probably the instigators of this request, since the Narthakians had evidently been successful only a couple of years previously in convincing the tribunal from Asia Minor of the justice of their claims (**154**). The involvement of Rome in this case provides an uncommon example of arbitration by the senate itself. A common pattern adopted by Rome in the second century when the Greeks turned to Rome more and more to settle their conflicts was to make a general ruling and then request another Greek state to carry out the details of the arbitration.[2] The general ruling often stated that territory in dispute was to belong to whichever state was in possession of it when the states entered into *amicitia* with Rome. The same pattern obtains here as far as the latter regulation goes, but this time the senate itself agreed to hear the particulars of the dispute. Even when the senate agreed to hear their arguments, however, disputants could not expect to receive an extremely detailed judgement. The Melitaians and Narthakians had evidently

1. See Stählin, *Philologus* 88; Kramolisch; Broughton, vol. 2, p. 643; vol. 3, pp. 103–4; and Sherk, p. 52.

2. Cf. **88**, **131**, **135**, **141**, **159**.

marshalled the evidence of several centuries' worth of judgements on their case; but the Roman senate in 140 did not give them an independent decision. Instead it referred back to the settlement given in accordance with Flamininus's edicts over half a century before, and stated that the Greeks should abide by that.[3]

The actual inscription, set up by Narthakion and dated by reference to Thessalian and local officials, records the terms of the senatorial decree on the conflict. The embassies from both sides spoke before the senate, and the final decree refers to the evidence the Melitaians and Narthakians put forth. Both states were anxious to show their loyalty to Roman interests and prefaced their arguments with requests for formal renewal of ties of *amicitia* and *societas* (lines 18–19, 41–42). The Melitaian testimony is recorded first, perhaps because they had been the instigators of this hearing. In addition to pointing out their previous successes in the struggle with Narthakion,[4] the Melitaians argued that they had indeed been in possession of the disputed territory when they entered into Roman *amicitia*, and that the Narthakians had subsequently (and unjustly) taken it from them. The Narthakians admitted that the disputed land was currently in their possession, although their interpretation of events differs from that of the Melitaians. There is no mention of any "unjust" seizure of the territory, and furthermore the Narthakians, just like the Melitaians, argued that the land had been in their possession when they became *amici* of Rome.

It is difficult to reconstruct reliably the history of the disputed territory. The Narthakian and Melitaian claims appear to be mutually exclusive, and the issue is obscured by the summary nature of the Roman decree. Furthermore, the phrasing of the Narthakian admission to their occupation of this territory is ambiguous and unclear.[5] The Melitaians refer to an "unjust" occupation of the territory by the Narthakians; but this accusation could as easily refer to an arbitral judgement that had disadvantaged the Melitaians as to an actual seizure of the land. The ambiguity regarding the ownership of the land at the precise time when the states became Roman *amici* may be attributed to the land

3. When the Prienians and Samians requested Roman arbitration in these same years they received a similar response: the Roman senate consented to give a ruling, but it was one in accordance with a previous (extremely detailed) decision, made by the Rhodians (see **160**).

4. See **32** and Piccirilli 35 and 51.

5. Lines 44–46: περὶ χώρας [καὶ] ἰ[ε]ρ[ῶν περὶ τῆ]ς τε| ἀφ[ῃ]ρη[μένης] τ[ῆς κατὰ Μελιτ]α[ι]έας ἀρχῆς Ναρ|θακιέ[ω]ν [τῶν] ἐν τ[ῇ Ἀχαι]ί[α]ι·. This phrase has generated a number of conflicting translations: "about the land and sanctuaries and about the land taken from the rule of Melitaia, land of the Narthakieians in Achaia Phthiotis" (Sherk, *TDGR*); "about. . . their land and temples, and about the land of Narthacium in Achaea which had been annexed and is under the rule of Meletaea" (Jones); "about the land and the temples and about the control over Melitaea, which had been rescinded, by the Narthacians in Achaea" (*ARS*); "the land and sanctuaries, i.e., the land taken away from Melitaean rule by the Narthacians in Achaea" (Lewis/Reinhold).

changing hands at the time of the Second Macedonian War and the restitution of the Thessalian League. If Melitaia still held the land in 196, then it might claim to have been in possession of it when it became a friend of Rome; but if Narthakion benefitted from the land changing hands as a result of Flamininus's rulings and the arbitration of the Thessalians shortly after 196, then it might also make the same claim. If Narthakion and Melitaia did not become Roman *amici* at precisely the same date, then the legitimacy of the claims of both sides is obvious, as is the basic flaw in the Roman procedure.

The Narthakians certainly considered that their arguments in 140 gained force from the participation of Rome, however indirect, in the arbitration at the beginning of the second century (**79**). The references to Flamininus and the *senatus consultum* connected with his regulations were perhaps calculated to influence the senate in their favour. If so, the attempt paid off. Nevertheless, it cannot be assumed that Rome invariably supported previous judgements in which its officials had taken part. When Samos and Priene took their case before the senate, around the same time as the Melitaians and Narthakians, the Romans overturned the decision of Manlius Vulso in favour of a previous arbitral decision made by the Greek state of Rhodes (**160**). But the rationale behind the Roman decision in the Samos-Priene conflict was in essence the same as that underlying their ultimate judgement on Melitaia and Narthakion: that ignoring earlier and legally valid decisions was not a thing to be done lightly.[6] The remark that previous decisions in Narthakion's favour had been given in accordance with law, and that the senate felt bound to abide by that, may or may not have been meant as a reprimand to the Melitaians and a subtle hint that they think twice about appealing the decision.

157. A boundary arbitration between two unknown states (c. 140?)

Two fragments from Delphi, recognized by Marcadé as belonging to the same inscription. H (max.): 0.265 m; w (max.): 0.23 m; d (max.): 0.24 m.

Pomtow, *Klio* 18 (1923) p. 285, nos. 211–12 (lines 1–13); *SEG* II.279 (lines 1–13); Daux, *Delphes*, p. 647 (lines 1–13); J.-P. Michaud, *FDelphes* II, p. 129 (lines 18–23); *J. Pouilloux, *FDelphes* III.4.368 (lines 1–13); G. Daux, *BCH* 105 (1981) pp. 576–80 (lines 1–13); *F. Queyrel, *BCH* 108 (1984) pp. 703–7 (lines 10–23).

J. Marcadé, *Recueil des signatures de sculpteurs grecs* (Paris, 1953) vol. 1, pp. 122–23; Robert, *REG* 1974, 291; G. Daux, *BCH* 101 (1977) pp. 333–34.

6. Lines 63–67. Cf. **160**, II, lines 10–11: ἡμῖν οὐκ εὐχ[ερ]ὲς {εἶναι} ἐστιν μετα|θεῖναι ἃ ὁ δῆμος ὁ Ῥοδίων ἑκατέρων θελόντων κέκρι[κε]. See Ager, *AHB* 3.5.

changing hands at the time of the Second Macedonian War and the restitution of the Thessalian League. If Melitaia still held the land in 196, then it might claim to have been in possession of it when it became a friend of Rome; but if Narthakion benefitted from the land changing hands as a result of Flamininus's rulings and the arbitration of the Thessalians shortly after 196, then it might also make the same claim. If Narthakion and Melitaia did not become Roman *amici* at precisely the same date, then the legitimacy of the claims of both sides is obvious, as is the basic flaw in the Roman procedure.

The Narthakians certainly considered that their arguments in 140 gained force from the participation of Rome, however indirect, in the arbitration at the beginning of the second century (**79**). The references to Flamininus and the *senatus consultum* connected with his regulations were perhaps calculated to influence the senate in their favour. If so, the attempt paid off. Nevertheless, it cannot be assumed that Rome invariably supported previous judgements in which its officials had taken part. When Samos and Priene took their case before the senate, around the same time as the Melitaians and Narthakians, the Romans overturned the decision of Manlius Vulso in favour of a previous arbitral decision made by the Greek state of Rhodes (**160**). But the rationale behind the Roman decision in the Samos-Priene conflict was in essence the same as that underlying their ultimate judgement on Melitaia and Narthakion: that ignoring earlier and legally valid decisions was not a thing to be done lightly.[6] The remark that previous decisions in Narthakion's favour had been given in accordance with law, and that the senate felt bound to abide by that, may or may not have been meant as a reprimand to the Melitaians and a subtle hint that they think twice about appealing the decision.

157. A boundary arbitration between two unknown states (c. 140?)

Two fragments from Delphi, recognized by Marcadé as belonging to the same inscription. H (max.): 0.265 m; w (max.): 0.23 m; d (max.): 0.24 m.

Pomtow, *Klio* 18 (1923) p. 285, nos. 211–12 (lines 1–13); *SEG* II.279 (lines 1–13); Daux, *Delphes*, p. 647 (lines 1–13); J.-P. Michaud, *FDelphes* II, p. 129 (lines 18–23); *J. Pouilloux, *FDelphes* III.4.368 (lines 1–13); G. Daux, *BCH* 105 (1981) pp. 576–80 (lines 1–13); *F. Queyrel, *BCH* 108 (1984) pp. 703–7 (lines 10–23).

J. Marcadé, *Recueil des signatures de sculpteurs grecs* (Paris, 1953) vol. 1, pp. 122–23; Robert, *REG* 1974, 291; G. Daux, *BCH* 101 (1977) pp. 333–34.

6. Lines 63–67. Cf. **160**, II, lines 10–11: ἡμῖν οὐκ εὐχ[ερ]ὲς {εἶναι} ἐστιν μετα|θεῖναι ἃ ὁ δῆμος ὁ Ῥοδίων ἑκατέρων θελόντων κέκρι[κε]. See Ager, *AHB* 3.5.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - . . -
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -ει καὶ ε- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - - - -λας καὶ ὑπάρχειν [αὐτῶι καὶ ἐκγόνοις θεαροδοκίαν?,]
[προξενίαν, προμαντείαν, πρ]οδικίαν, ἀσυλίαν, ἀ[τέλειαν, προεδρίαν ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς]
[ἀγώνοις οἷς ἁ πόλις τίθητι καὶ τἄλ]λα τίμια ὅσα καὶ τ[οῖς ἄλλοις προξένοις καὶ]
[εὐεργέταις τᾶς πόλιος· ἄρχοντος Ξενο]κρίτου, βουλευόντ[ων τὰν πρώταν ἐξάμηνον Cωξένου τοῦ]
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 'Εχεφύλου, Cω[σιπάτρου τοῦ Αἰακίδα, γραμματεύον]-
[- - - - - - - - - - - ἐποί]ησε -
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -τος δὲ Γενν[αίου τοῦ Ἡράκωνος.]
- - - - - - - - - - - . ταιέος, μηνὸς ὡς ΟΙ[- - - ἄγοντι - - -]
- - - - - - - - - - - -νοκράτεος Φανοτέ[ος - - - - - - - - - -]
[- - - - - - - - το]ῦ Ἀνφιμάχου Μελιται[έος - - - - - - - - -]
[- - Τάδε ἔκριναν οἱ δικασταὶ οἱ ἀποσ]ταλέντες ὑπὸ τῶν - - - -
[- -]
- -
- -
- -
- - - - - - - - -ΣΟΡ . ΙΙ- -
[- - - - τὰς γ]υπίδας πέτρας ἀπε[δείκνυον - - - - - - - - -]
[- - - - ἀπε]δείκνυον· ἐκ τᾶν γυ[ιδᾶν πετρᾶν - - - - - - -]
[- - - ἐκ τᾶς ν]άπας τοῦ Κηλα . c- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
[- - - - ἄ]λαδε ΑΛΦΑΔΙΙ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - -ϒΙΙ . . . . -

10: [Μελι]ταιέος: Daux, *Delphes*. [Μελ]ιταιέος, μηνὸς ὡς Θε[σσαλοὶ ἄγοντι]: Daux, *BCH*. || 11: [Ξε]ν[ο]κράτεος, TANOTE[- -]: Pomtow. Pomtow suggests [Ἀγησίλαος Ξε]ν[ο]κράτεος; Daux suggests [Ξε]νοκράτεος or [Δει]νοκράτεος. || 12: [το]ῦ Ἀνφιμάχου, Μελίτων[ος τοῦ Τιμοκράτους?]: Pomtow. Ἀμφιμάχου: Daux, Pouilloux. || 13: [διότι ἐξαπος]ταλέντες ὑπὸ τῶν [Ἀθηναίων δικασταὶ]: Pomtow. || 21: ΚΗΛΑΣϒ[ρου]: Michaud. || 22: [ἄ]λαδε ἀλφαδί[ωι]: Bousquet.

This inscription from Delphi actually consists of three separate documents. The first (lines 1–7) is the closing fragment of a typical decree granting *proxenia* and other honours. This decree can be dated to the archonship of Xenokritos, 140/39 B.C. Following it are the scanty remains of an artist's signature from the third century B.C. (lines 8–9). The final portion, to which the lower fragment (lines 18–23) has recently been added, appears to record the findings of an arbitral tribunal. The style of this third document is close enough to that of the first to suggest that they are more or less contemporary.[1]

1. Michaud had at first conjectured that the fragment containing lines 18–23 belonged to the extensive inscription in **129**.

The arbitral inscription may have been dated by the eponymous magistrate of the homeland of the judges. The appearance of an ethnic (line 10: -ταιέος) indicates that the magistrate may have been the official of a *koinon*, such as perhaps the Phokian *koinon* or the Thessalian League.[2] Both choices seem to be a possibility, as the city names of Phanoteus (in Phokis) and Melitaia (in Thessaly) appear in the following lines. Nevertheless, the inscription is really too fragmentary to say whether these states appear as arbitrators, as witnesses, or as parties to the dispute. The only thing that seems certain is that Phanoteus and Melitaia could not have had a boundary dispute with one another, as they have no common border.

158. Magnesia and Rome settle the disputes of Hierapytna and Itanos (c. 140–111)

A fair amount of epigraphic material pertaining to this case has survived. There are two main documents of interest here, one of which (II) exists in two copies.

I: An inscription discovered in 1919 at the site of ancient Itanos. H: 1.25 m; w: 0.48–0.50 m; d: 0.13–0.15 m.

S. A. Xanthoudides, *AE* 1920, pp. 82–86; W. Crönert, *SEG* II.511; Guarducci, *IC* III.iv, pp. 106–11, no. 10; *Sherk 14.

II: Two fragmentary copies of this document survive, one from Cretan Itanos (A), the other from the arbitrating state of Magnesia (B). The text given is the composite reading of Guarducci. A: h: 1.125 m; w: 0.81 m. B: h: 1.47 m; w: 0.76 m; d: 0.12 m.

F. Halbherr, *MusItal* 3 (1890) pp. 57of., no. 3 (A); Böckh, *CIG add.* 2561b (A); Berard 48 and pp. 113f. (A); Dittenberger, *SIG*^{2} 929 (A and B); de Ruggiero 10 (A); F. Blass, *SGDI* 5060 (partial reproduction of A and B); Dittenberger/Hiller von Gaertringen, *SIG*^{3} 685 (A and B); *IGRR* 1021 (A and B); Kern, *IMagM* 105 (A and B); *Guarducci, *IC* III.iv, pp. 91–106, no. 9 (A and B; q.v. for further bibliography of earlier editions).

Sonne 35, *add.* pp. 122–23; Viereck 26; A. Wilhelm, *AEM* 20 (1897) p. 71; A. Scrinzi, *AIV* 55.2 (1897–98) p. 1515; U. von Wilamowitz, *GGA* 162 (1900) p. 566; R. S. Conway, *ABSA* 8 (1901–2) pp. 137–38; Colin, pp. 510f.; G. Cardinali, *RFC* 35 (1907) pp. 26f.; S. A. Xanthoudides, *AE* 1908, pp. 214f., 238; Phillipson, p. 158; Raeder 74; M. Holleaux, *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 6 (1913) pp. 14–15; Tod 56; M. Cary, *JRS* 16 (1926) pp. 194–200; G. de Sanctis, *RFC* n.s. 4 (1926)

2. Queyrel, pp. 706–7. Daux (*BCH* 105) suggests the Thessalians. Pomtow had earlier argued in favour of Athenian judges here.

The arbitral inscription may have been dated by the eponymous magistrate of the homeland of the judges. The appearance of an ethnic (line 10: -ταιέος) indicates that the magistrate may have been the official of a *koinon*, such as perhaps the Phokian *koinon* or the Thessalian League.[2] Both choices seem to be a possibility, as the city names of Phanoteus (in Phokis) and Melitaia (in Thessaly) appear in the following lines. Nevertheless, the inscription is really too fragmentary to say whether these states appear as arbitrators, as witnesses, or as parties to the dispute. The only thing that seems certain is that Phanoteus and Melitaia could not have had a boundary dispute with one another, as they have no common border.

158. Magnesia and Rome settle the disputes of Hierapytna and Itanos (c. 140–111)

A fair amount of epigraphic material pertaining to this case has survived. There are two main documents of interest here, one of which (II) exists in two copies.

I: An inscription discovered in 1919 at the site of ancient Itanos. H: 1.25 m; w: 0.48–0.50 m; d: 0.13–0.15 m.

S. A. Xanthoudides, *AE* 1920, pp. 82–86; W. Crönert, *SEG* II.511; Guarducci, *IC* III.iv, pp. 106–11, no. 10; *Sherk 14.

II: Two fragmentary copies of this document survive, one from Cretan Itanos (A), the other from the arbitrating state of Magnesia (B). The text given is the composite reading of Guarducci. A: h: 1.125 m; w: 0.81 m. B: h: 1.47 m; w: 0.76 m; d: 0.12 m.

F. Halbherr, *MusItal* 3 (1890) pp. 57of., no. 3 (A); Böckh, *CIG add.* 2561b (A); Berard 48 and pp. 113f. (A); Dittenberger, *SIG*^{2} 929 (A and B); de Ruggiero 10 (A); F. Blass, *SGDI* 5060 (partial reproduction of A and B); Dittenberger/Hiller von Gaertringen, *SIG*^{3} 685 (A and B); *IGRR* 1021 (A and B); Kern, *IMagM* 105 (A and B); *Guarducci, *IC* III.iv, pp. 91–106, no. 9 (A and B; q.v. for further bibliography of earlier editions).

Sonne 35, *add.* pp. 122–23; Viereck 26; A. Wilhelm, *AEM* 20 (1897) p. 71; A. Scrinzi, *AIV* 55.2 (1897–98) p. 1515; U. von Wilamowitz, *GGA* 162 (1900) p. 566; R. S. Conway, *ABSA* 8 (1901–2) pp. 137–38; Colin, pp. 510f.; G. Cardinali, *RFC* 35 (1907) pp. 26f.; S. A. Xanthoudides, *AE* 1908, pp. 214f., 238; Phillipson, p. 158; Raeder 74; M. Holleaux, *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 6 (1913) pp. 14–15; Tod 56; M. Cary, *JRS* 16 (1926) pp. 194–200; G. de Sanctis, *RFC* n.s. 4 (1926)

2. Queyrel, pp. 706–7. Daux (*BCH* 105) suggests the Thessalians. Pomtow had earlier argued in favour of Athenian judges here.

pp. 130–31; *SEG* III.775; Tod, *Sidelights*, p. 52–53; M. Holleaux, *BCH* 57 (1933) p. 18; L. Robert, *BCH* 59 (1935) p. 492; Heuss, pp. 143–44; Holleaux, *Études*, vol. 1, pp. 337f.; Passerini, *Athenaeum*; V. Arangio-Ruiz, *Studia et Documenta Historiae et Iuris* 2 (1939) pp. 592f.; Magie, *Buckler Studies*, p. 183; R. S. Bosanquet, *ABSA* 40 (1939–40) pp. 68–75; M. Guarducci, *RFC* n.s. 18 (1940) pp. 104–7; Robert, *REG* 1942, 144; H. van Effenterre, *REA* 44 (1942) pp. 31–51; O. Glossner, "Die Gebietsstreit zwischen Itanos und Hierapytna auf Kreta" (Diss., Erlangen, 1948); van Effenterre, p. 129; Broughton, vol. 1, pp. 536–38; F. W. Schehl, Κρητικὰ Χρονικά 5 (1951) pp. 305f.; Robert, *REG* 1953, 172; R. F. Willetts, *Aristocratic Society in Ancient Crete* (London, 1955) p. 240; Johnson et al., *ARS* 50; A. Brelich, *Guerre, agoni e culta nella Grecia arcaica* (Bonn, 1961) pp. 61f.; Préaux, pp. 248f.; R. F. Willetts, *Ancient Crete: A Social History* (London and Toronto, 1965) p. 156; H. van Effenterre/M. Bougrat, Κρητικὰ Χρονικά 21 (1969) pp. 9–53; M. Guarducci, *Epigrafia greca*, pp. 557f.; S. Spyridakis, *Ptolemaic Itanos and Hellenistic Crete* (Berkeley, 1970) pp. 49–66; Robert, *REG* 1976, 546; A. Mehl, *Ancient Society* 11–12 (1980–81) pp. 206–7; Thür, pp. 474, 483; Chaniotis, *Ktema*, pp. 26f.

I: The Itanos inscription

. . . . . κατακτάσιος πρεσβευταὶ Κρῆτες Ἱεραπύτνιοι Φείδων Ἐτεάνορος ὑός,
Κ̣ώμων . . . . . ρος [ὑ]ός, Μνάσιππος Δίωνος ὑός, Εὐβέτης Βειδύλω ὑός, λόγον ἐποιή-
σαντο χ[άριτα φιλ]ίαν συμμαχίαν τε ἀνενεώσαντο καὶ συνηςθῆναι τῇ συνκλήτῳ ἐπὶ τῷ
[- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - εἶπ]αςαν καὶ καθ' ἰδίαν ἐπὶ τὸ βέλτειον προχωρεῖν περί τε τῆς γεγενημ[έ]-
νης [- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - φιλοτ]ιμίας εὐχαρίστηςα[ν] καὶ περὶ τῶν ἀδικημάτων τῶν ἡμῖν γεγενη-
μένων - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - Ἰτάνιοι γὰρ ἀδικημάτων μὴ γινομένων ὑ[φ'] ἡμῶν αὐτοῖς, ὑπὸ δὲ
[τῆς τῶν] Κνωςίων [πό]λεως ποτέ, πόλεμον ἀπαράνγελτον ἡμῖν ἐποίηςαν παρὰ τὰ τῆς συν-
κλήτου δόγματα καὶ ἀδικήματα [ἡμῖν] ἐξετελέςαντο, περὶ ὧν καὶ πρότερον πρεσβείας ἀ-
πεστείλαμεν [ἐπὶ τὴν σύνκλητον] μ[αρτυρού]σας τὰ γεγενημένα ἀδικήματα εἰς ἡμᾶς. ἡ δὲ
[σύνκλ]ητος κατα- -μεν ἐπὶ Μάρκου Αἰμυλίου καὶ ἐπὶ Μανί-
ου Ἀκιλίου ὑπάτων καὶ [ο]ὔτε συμμάχους αὐτοὺς προσηγόρευςε οὔτε Κνω-
ςίους οὔτε τοὺς
- - - - - - - - - - Δραγμίοις οὔτε - - - ὅπως ἀνεκρίθη καὶ ἐδογμάτιςε πόλεμον καὶ ἀδικήματα ἡ-
μῖν αν- παραγενόμενοι ὑπὲρ τε τοῦ πολέμου

καὶ - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -της ἡμέρας . . . . . ν ην ἀπεδείξαμεν ἡμετέραν οὖ-
15 σαν - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - διὰ γένους καὶ ἀνάβατ[ο]ν ὑπὸ μηθενὸ[ς] γεωργηθεῖσαν, τὴν
δὲ νῆσον τὴν καλουμένην Λεύκην ἡμετέραν οὖσαν ἐκ προγόνων. Ἰτάνιοι δὲ μὴ δυνάμενοι περὶ τῶν
- -των εἰς ἡμᾶς ἀδικημάτ[ω]ν ἀπολογήσασθαι μήτε πρότερον
μήτε νῦν -των πρεσβευτῶν ἀντενκαλοῦσιν ἡμῖν
- τὴν χώραν περισσὰν οὖσαν ἔτεσι εἴκοσι ὀκτώ, λόγους ἐ-
20 ποιησα- πρὸς τῇ συνκλήτῳ, ἡ δὲ σύνκλητος ἐδογμάτισε
[ὅπως τὴν χώραν καὶ τὴν νῆσον πολ]έ[μου ἀρ]χὴν ἑλομένου διακατέσχομεν, ἵνα οὕτως κα-
τέ[χω]μεν· πρᾶξιν στρατηγοῦ εἶναι, καὶ ὅπως Λαίλιος δῆμον δῷ τὸν ἐν ἡμῖν κρινοῦντα. δοθέν-
τος δὲ ἡμῖν τοῦ Μαγνήτων δήμου καὶ Γαίου Λαιλίου ὑπάτου γράψαντος [πρ]ὸς τὸν δῆμον τὸν Μα-
γνήτων - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - καὶ τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τὴν ὑπ' αὐ[τ]οῦ [γ]ραφεῖσαν ἐμ μη-
25 - δὲ ὡς ὑφ' ἡμῶν τε κἀκείνων ὁμόλογον ἐγενήθη. ᵛ
- ἴσαντι τὴν νῆσον τὴν καλουμένην Λεύκην καὶ τὴν χώ-
ραν -ος ὁ δῆμος ὁ Μαγνήτων ἔκρινε κατὰ τὸ δό-
[γμα τῆς συνκλήτου ὑπ'] Ἰτανίων [προγο]νικὰς οὔσας καρπίζεσθαι κυρίως. οὐ συναντη-
σαμεν- ἡμῶν αἰτίαν ἐπιφέρουσι
30 . ε . σον[- τε]λευτα[ί]ας ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἀνει-
- -αντες ἐπὶ τὴν σύνκλητον εν
- -ν εἰς Κρήτην τε παραγεγονότων
καὶ τὰς [- πρ]εσ[β]είας οὐδέποτε περὶ τούτων φω-
νὴν προῆκαν -πρεσβεύοντες περὶ τῶν ἐν[ε]-
35 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

- - - -

χώρᾳ ὠικοδομημένον ἔνες[τιν] ὅπως αὐτοὺς καθελεῖν κελεύ[c]ῃ. περὶ δὲ τῶν λο[ι]-
[π]ῶν πραγμάτων ὧν λόγους ἐποιήcacθε ὅταν ἡ ἐcχάτη Κρητῶν πρεcβεία εἰc
τὴν cύνκλητον εἰcεπρέc[βευ]caν οὕτ[ω]c ἀποκρῖναι καθὼc ἂν αὐτῷ ἐκ τῶν δημοcί-
ων πραγμάτων πίcτεώc τε τῆc ἰδίαc φαίνηται, ἔδοξε. ᵛ
[τοῦ]το τὸ πρᾶγμα δέλτου ὀγδόης κηρώματι [τeccαρec]καιδεκάτῳ μετὰ cυμ-
βουλίου ἐπέγνων πρὸ ἡμερῶν δέκα ἑπτὰ Καλ. Κοινκτειλίων ἐν τῇ βαcιλι-
κῇ τῇ Πορκίᾳ [- - - - - - - - - - - - - ἡ]μέρας τυχούc[ηc ἰe]ρᾶc κατὰ cυνκλήτου
δόγμα [- ἀπὸ cυμβουλί]ου γνώμηc γνώμην
ἀπεφηνάμην [- o]ὕτω[c] καθὼc πρότερον
- -cι ἡμέραν ὁρ[ιῶ] πρὸ ἧc ἡμέραc κρίνωcι
ε[ὐcεβῶc τε καὶ δικαίωc τὴν διαφορὰν] καὶ ε[ἴ τι ἐνῳ]κοδόμηται μετὰ τὸ
τοὺc πρεcβευτὰc -cω ἐν αὐτοῖc τὸν δῆ-
μον τὸν ὑμέτερον κατὰ [τὸ τῆc cυνκλήτου δόγμα] φροντίcαι ὅπως ἐκ τοῦ
πολιτεύματοc [ὑμῶν ἀποcτείλητε δικα]cτὰc καλοὺc κἀγαθοὺc τριάκον-
τα ἕνα οἳ τὸ - - - - - - κατὰ τὸ τῆc cυνκλήτου δόγμα κρίνωcι Κοινκτειλί-
ων τῶν ἐ[πὶ Λευκίου Καλο]πορνίου καὶ Μάρκου Λειβίου ὑπάτων ἐν ἡμέραιc τριακο-
cίαιc ἑξήκοντα, ἐὰν δὲ πρὸ ἐκείνηc τῆc ἡμέραc μὴ κρίνωcι, τότε ὅπωc
ἐν τῇ ἑξηκοcτῇ καὶ τριακοcιοcτῇ ἡμέρᾳ κρίνωc[ι].ᵛ
Λεύκιοc Καλοπόρνιοc Λευκίου ὑὸc Πείcων ὕπατοc Ἱεραπυ-
τνίων τοῖc ἄρχουcι καὶ τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ χαίρειν· [ἰό]ντεc
Ἰτάνιοι πρεcβευταὶ καὶ ὑμέτεροι προcήλθοcάν μ[οι ὅπ]ωc
αὐτοῖc cύνκλητον δῷ. ἐγὼ αὐτοῖc cύνκλητ[ο]ν ἔδωκα.
cυνκλήτου δόγμα τοῦτο γεγονόc ἐcτι· ὑμᾶc θέλ[ω] φροντί-
cαι εἴ τι ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ χώρᾳ τῇ ἐν ἀνφιλ[ογ]είᾳ οὔcῃ ἐνῳ-
κοδομημένον ἐcτί, ὅπωc ἐκ ταύτηc τ[ῆc χώ]ραc καθέ-
λητε οὕτωc καθὼc ἡ cύνκλητοc ἐδογμάτιcε καὶ κα-
. . . . . ωcε. ἀπὸ cυμβουλίου γνώμηc γνώ[μην ἀ]πεφηνάμην.

Crönert's text (*SEG*) varies widely from the text established by Guarducci and employed by Sherk; not all of Crönert's variants have been reproduced here. || 2: or Πώμων: Sherk, Guarducci. Ποcιδίωνοc ὑόc, Εὐβέτηc: Xanthoudides. || 4: κοινῇ τε εὐcταθεῖν: Crönert. προχωρεῖν ἐ[πί] τε: Xanthoudides. || 5: εὐχαριcτῆc[αι κα]ὶ: Xanthoudides. || 8: [ἐπεκα]λέcαντο περὶ ὧν: Xanthoudides. || 9: δὲ τὰ γεγενημένα: Xanthoudides. || 19–20: [ἐ]ν ἔτεcι εἴκοcι ὀκτὼ λόγουc ἐ|[ποιήcαντο]: Xanthoudides. || 24: cυνγραφεῖcαν: Xanthoudides. || 24–25: ἐμ μη[νί?]: Sherk, Guarducci; restored by Xanthoudides, Crönert. || 28–29: οὐ cυναντηcαμέν[ων δὲ ἡμῶν]: Guarducci. οὐ cυναντή|[cαντεc]: Xanthoudides. || 32: [πρεcβευτῶ]ν?: Sherk, Guarducci. || 33: [πρ]ec[β]είαc or [πρ]ec[β]είαν: Sherk, Guarducci. || 34–35: ἐν[ecτηκότων]: Crönert. || 38–39: νενικηκό|[τεc]: Xanthoudides. || 40: αὐ[τὸ]ν or αὐ[τῶ]ν?: Sherk. || 42: [κρα]τουμ[έ]νουc: Xanthoudides. [οὐδὲ τοὺc ἄνδραc ἀπέδοcαν τοὺc κρα]τουμ[έ]νουc ὑπ' αὐτῶν: Crönert. || 44–45: γενομε|[νοι]: Xanthoudides. || 45–46: αὐ|[τοὺc]: Xanthoudides. || 49:

πα[ρα]γεγονότων ἕως: Xanthoudides. || 56: εἵηcαν τῆc προ: Xanthoudides. || 58: [νέ]μωcιν καρπίζωνται: Xanthoudides. || 59: [προcέρχε]cθαι?: Guarducci. || 60: [οἵ]τινεc?: Guarducci. || 63–64: πωc ἐν ἑαυτοῖc κρί|[νωcι]: Xanthoudides. || 64: [καθέ]cτηκε: Xanthoudides. || 66: κρίνωcιν αὐτοῦ: Xanthoudides. || 67: τέρμ[α] τε ὁρίcῃ πρὸc ἡμε-: Xanthoudides. || 68: [πρεcβευ]τάc?: Guarducci. || 75: [τεccαρεc]καιδεκάτῳ: Schehl. || 75–76: [παρεῖ]ναι δὲ κάτω μετὰ cυμ|[πρέcβεων]: Xanthoudides. || 77: ταῖc ἱ[λα]ραῖc [ὥραιc ἡ]μέραc?: Guarducci. || 77–78: τ̣α̣ῖ̣c ⟨κ⟩[αθα]ρ̣α̣ῖ̣c [δὲ τῆc ἡ]μέραc τυχούc[ηc ἱε]ρᾶc κατὰ cυνκλήτου| δόγμα [ὥραιc]: Schehl. || 80: [τοῖc περὶ δὲ τῶν ὅρων αὐτῶν δικάca]ι κτλ: Schehl. || 82: c̣τ̣ή̣cω?: Guarducci. [παραγενέcθαι πρότερον· αἰτή]cω: Schehl. || 84: [ὑμῶν χειροτονῆτε δικα]cτὰc κτλ.: Schehl. || 85: [ἀμφιcβήτημα]: Schehl. Sherk would find ἡ ἀμφιcβήτηcιc or τὰ ἀμφιcβητούμενα preferable. || 86–87: τριάκο|[ντα]: Xanthoudides.

II: The Itanos-Magnesia inscription

A Θ̣ ε̣ ὸ [c] ἀ [γ] α̣ θ̣ ό̣ [c].

[ἐ]πὶ Ὀλυμπικοῦ ˅ C[μιciῶν]oc ˅ ε΄˅ ἱcταμένου ˅ ἀπ̣ό̣φαcιc Εὐφήμου τοῦ [Παυcανίου,]

γ̣εωκόρου τῆc Ἀρτέμιδ[ο]c τῆc Λευκοφρυηνῆc, ˅ Κίλλου τοῦ Δημητρίου, ⟨Ἀ⟩ριcταγόρου τοῦ Δημο- -,

Ἀπολλωνίου τοῦ Ἀλέξωνος, Λυκομήδου τοῦ Εὐπολέμου, Δημητρίου τοῦ Δημητρίου τοῦ Ἡροπύθου,

Δημητρίου τοῦ Δημητρίου τοῦ Ἀναξαγόρου, Αἰδούχου τοῦ Ἀπολλοδώρου, Μιννίωνος τοῦ Διονυ-

cίου τοῦ Μιννίωνος, Ἐπικούρου τοῦ Ἀρτεμιδώρου τοῦ Μοcχίωνος, Παυccι-κράτου τοῦ Ἡροπύθου, Ἀπολ-

λωνί[ο]υ [τ]οῦ Ἀπολλωνίου, Εὐβούλου τοῦ Ἀλεξίωνος, Βοήθου τοῦ Ἀνδρομάχου, Ἀρτεμιδώρου τοῦ Δη-

μητ̣ρίου, Ἀπολλωνίου τοῦ Διονυcοδώρου, Ἐπικράτου τοῦ Διοκλέους τοῦ Διονυcοκλέου̣c̣, Ε̣ὐβούλου

τοῦ Μάνδρωνος, κεχειροτονημένων καὶ αὐτῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου δικάcαι Κρηcὶν Ἰτ[ανίοις τε κα]ὶ Ἱ[ερ]απυ-

τνί̣[οιc κατὰ τὸ γεγο]νὸc ὑπὸ τῆc cυγκλήτου δόγμα καὶ κατ⟨ὰ⟩ τὴν ἀποcταλεῖca[ν ἐπιcτολὴν ὑπὸ] Λευ̣-

κ̣[ίου Καλοπορνίου Λε]υκίου υἱοῦ Πείcωνοc cτρατηγοῦ ὑπάτου· εὐκτὸν μὲν ἦν - - -

ι- - - - - - - - - - - ἡμῶν εἰc μηδεμίαν φιλονικίαν καὶ πλεοναζο- - - - - - - -

δ- - - - - - - - - - -ιεcθαι μετ' εἰρήνης δὲ καὶ τῆc πάcηc ὁμονοίαc [καὶ οἰκειότητο]c

τ[ὴν πρὸc ἀλλήλο]υc διαφυλάccειν εὔνοιαν· ἐπειδὴ ⟨δὲ⟩ οἱ καιροὶ πολλ[άκιc - -]c

c- - - - - - - - - τοὺc cυνγενεcτάτουc εἰc διάcταcιν τὴν πρ⟨ὸ⟩c ἀ[λλήλουc ἐξάγουcι]ν

α- - - - - - - - - π̣ᾶ̣cιν τοῖc οὖcιν ἐν φιλίαι διαλύειν ὅcον ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖc [τὰc ἐκ παλαιῶν] χρό-

νω[ν αὐτοῖς . . . .]ε̣λη(λ)υθυίας ἔκθρας ᵛ, ὅθεν καὶ τὰ νῦν εἰς τὴν μὲν - - - - - . ε
λ . [. . . . ’Ιτανί]ων καὶ ‘Ιεραπυτνίων· ᵛ τῆς δὲ συνκλήτου στοιχουμ̣[ένης τῆι παρ’ ἑαυ]τῆι
πρ[ὸς πάντας ἀνθρώ]πους ὑπαρχούσηι δικαιοσύνηι δούσης κριτὴν αὐτ[οῖς τὸν ἡμέτερ]ον
δῆ[μον, γράψαντος] δὲ περὶ τούτων καὶ τοῦ στρατηγοῦ Λευκίου Καλοπορ[νίου Λευκίου υ]ἱοῦ
Πείσωνος, [καθ]ότι τὰ ἀποδοθέντα ἡμῖν ὑπ’ ἑκατέρων γράμματα περιέχει, ὁ δῆμος ἡμῶν
τοῖς τε ὑπὸ ‘Ρωμαίων τῶν κοινῶν εὐεργετῶν διὰ παντὸς γραφομένοις πείθεσθαι προαιρούμε-
νος, μεμνημένος τε τῶν διὰ προγόνων ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς γεγενημένων ὑφ’ ἑαυτοῦ πρὸς πάντας Κρητα-
εῖς καλῶν καὶ ἐνδόξων, ἃ καὶ θεοῦ χρησμοῖς καὶ τῆι παρὰ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις εἰδήσει κα[τ]είληπται, καὶ νῦν
μετὰ σπουδῆς καὶ φιλοτιμίας ἐποιήσατο τὴν αἵρεσιν τοῦ δικαστηρίου ἐν τῆι ὑφ’ ἑκατέρων γενηθεί[σηι]
ὁμολόγωι ἡμέραι. ἀποδειχθέντες οὖν καὶ αὐτοὶ κριταὶ παραχρῆμα ἀναβάντες ἐπὶ τὸν βωμὸν τῆς Ἀρτέμι-
δος τῆς Λευκοφρυηνῆς σφαγιασθέντος ἱερείου ὠμόσαμεν καθ’ ἱερῶν, παρόντων τῶν τε διαδικα-
AB ζομένων ἀφ’ ἑκατέρας πόλεως καὶ τῶν συνπαρόντων αὐτοῖς, καὶ καθίσαντες ἐν τῶι ἱερῶι τῆς
Ἀρτέμιδος τῆς Λευκοφρυηνῆς διηκούσαμεν τῶν διαφερομένων οὐ μόνον τὸν τῆς ἡμέ[ρ]ας αὐ-
τοῖς δόντες χρόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ πλεῖον τῆς νυκτός, πᾶσαν ἀναδεχόμενοι κακοπαθίαν χά[ρ]ιν τοῦ
μηθενὸς ὑστερῆσαι δικαίου μηθένα τῶν κρινομένων.ᵛ τέλος δὲ λαβούσης τῆς δικαιολογίας
ἐνγράφους θέμενοι τὰς γνώμας, τῶι μὲν ἀκριβεῖ τῆς ψήφου βραβευθῆναι τὴν κρίσιν οὐκ ἠβουλό-
μεθα, συναγαγεῖν δὲ σπεύδοντες αὐτοὺς καὶ αὐτοὶ καὶ πάλιν εἰς τὴν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἀποκαταστῆσαι
φιλίαν ὡς ἦν ἡμῖν πάτριον καὶ προσῆκον ἡγούμεθα ἑκατέρους, τὰ πράγματα ἐφ’ ἱκανὸν προσκεί-
μενοι εἰς τὸ συλλύσεως καὶ φιλίας αὐτοῖς παραίτιοι γενηθῆναι. τῆς δὲ προθέσεως ἡμῶν μὴ τελειουμέ-
νης διὰ τὸ ὑπερβαλλόντως αὐτοὺς τὴν πρὸς ἀλλήλους φιλονικίαν ἐνεστάσθαι, συνέβη τῆι κρίσιν βραβευθῆναι περὶ ἧς καὶ τὴν καθήκουσαν ἔχθεσιν πεποιήμεθα. ᵛ ’Ιτάνιοι πόλιν οἰκοῦν-
τες ἐπιθαλάσσιον καὶ χώραν ἔχοντες προγονικὴν γειτονοῦσαν τῶι τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Δικταίου ἱερῶι, ἔχον-
τες δὲ καὶ νήσους καὶ νεμόμενοι, ἐν αἷς καὶ τὴν καλουμένην Λεύκην, θλιβόμενοι κατά τινας καιροὺς

ὑπὸ τῶν παροróντων Πραιcίων ἐπεcπάcαντο χάριν βοηθείας καὶ φυλακῆc τῆc τε πόλεωc καὶ τῆc χώρας,
ἔτι δὲ καὶ τῶν νήcων, τὸν Αἰγύπτου βαcιλεύcαντα Πτολεμαῖον, ὡc τὰ παρατεθέντα ἡμῖν περὶ τούτων γράμματα περιεῖχεν, καὶ τούτωι τῶι τρόπωι διακατεῖχον τοὺc προειρημένουc τόπουc. ᵛ τελευτήcαντοc δὲ τοῦ Φιλομήτοροc βαcιλέωc Πτολεμαίου καὶ τῶν ἀποcταλέντων ὑπ' αὐτοῦ χάριν τοῦ cυντηρεῖν Ἰτανίοις τήν τε χώραν καὶ τὰc νήcουc ἀπαλλαγέντων, οὕτωc Ἰτάνιοι καὶ τῆι ἀπὸ τῶν φίλων εὐνοίαι cυνχρώμενοι διεφύλαccον τὰ καθ' ἑαυτούc. ἐνcτάντοc δὲ κατὰ τὴν Κρήτην πολέμου καὶ μείζονοc,
ἀνειρημένηc δὲ ἤδη καὶ τῆc Πραιcίων πόλεοc τῆc κειμένηc ἀνὰ μέcον Ἰτανίων τε καὶ Ἱεραπυτνίων, οὕτωc Ἱεραπύτνιοι τῆc τε νήcου καὶ τῆc χώραc ἀμφιcβητεῖν Ἰτανίοις ἐπεβάλαντο, φάμενοι τὴν μὲν χώραν εἶναι ἱερὰν τοῦ Ζηνὸc τοῦ Δικταίου, τὴν δὲ νῆcον προγονικὴν ἑαυτῶν ὑπάρχειν. τῶν δὲ παρὰ Ῥωμαίων πρεcβευτῶν τῶν περὶ Cερούιον Cολπίκιον παραγενομένων εἰc Κρήτην καὶ τοῦ πολέμου λύcιν λαβόντοc κατήντηcαν καὶ Ἰτάνιοι ἐπὶ τὴν cύνκλητον. δοθείcηc δὲ τῆc ἡμετέραc πόλεωc πρότερόν τε καὶ νῦν καὶ τοῦ δόγματοc περιέχοντοc "ὃν τρόπον ἑκάτεροι ταύτην τὴν
χώραν καὶ τὴν νῆcον, περὶ οὗ ἡ πρᾶξιc ἐνέcτηκε, κατεcχηκότεc εἶηcαν τῆι πρὸ τοῦ ἡμέραι ἢ ὁ πόλεμοc ἐν αὐτοῖc ἤρξατο, οὗ πολέμου ἕνεκεν Cερούιοc Cολπίκιοc κἀκείνη ἡ πρεcβεία εἰc Κρήτην ἀπεcτάληcαν, ὅπωc οὕτωc κρίνωcιν αὐτοὺc ἔχειν κατέχειν τε καρπίζεcθαί τε ἐξεῖναι", ἔγνωμεν· ἐκ τῆc ὑφ' ἑκατέρων γενηθείcηc δικαιολογίαc, τὴν χώραν [τὴ]ν ὑπὸ τὴν διαμφιcβήτηcιν ἠγμένην διακατεcχημένην
τε ὑπὸ Ἰτανίων καθότι προεκτεθείμεθα ἕω[c] τοῦ τὸν προδιαcεcαφημένον πόλεμον γενηθῆναι, οὖcαν
δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ τῆc ἀρχῆc Ἰτανίων καθ[ό]τι καὶ [οἱ ἐπιδειχ]θέντεc ἡμῖν ὑφ' ἑκατέρων περιοριcμοὶ τῆc χώραc ἐμήνυον, ᵛ ὅ τε πρὸc τοὺc πρότερον [παροροῦντας αὐτ]οῖc Δραγμίουc γενηθεὶc{ηc}περιέχων
οὕτωc· ᵛ "ὧροι δὲ ὄντων αὐτοῖc τᾶc χώραc τοί[δε· ὡc ὁ Cέδαμνοc] ἐc Καρύμαc καὶ πέραν ἐc τὰν cτεφάναν καὶ ἃ cτεφάνα περιάμπαξ ἐc ὀρθὸν ἐc Δο[ρθάννας ἐπὶ τὸν] λάκκον καὶ ἐc τὰν ὁδὸν καὶ πέραν ἐc
τὸν Μόλλον", καὶ πάλιν ὁ γενηθεὶc Ἰτανίοις [καὶ Πραιcίοις κα]θότι ὑπογέγραπται· ᵛ "ἔδοξε τοῖc Ἰτανίοιc καὶ τοῖc Πραιcίοιc θέcθαι εἰρήναν ἐc πάντ[α τὸ]ν χ[ρόνον ἐπὶ] τᾶι χώραι ἂν νῦν ἑκάτεροι ἔχοντι ἃc ὅρια τάδε·

ὡς ὁ Σέδαμνος ἐς Καρύμας ἐς τὰν δηράδα καὶ πέ[ραν ἐς] τὰν στεφάναν καὶ περιαμπέτις ὡς ἁ στεφάνα καὶ εὐθυ-
ωρίᾳ ἐς Δορθάννας ἐπὶ τὸν λάκκον καὶ ὡς ἁ ὁ[δὸς] ποτὶ μεσαμβρίαν τᾶς ὁδῶ τᾶς ἀγώσας δί Ἀτρῶνα καὶ ἐς
Μόλλον καὶ ἀπὸ τῶ Μόλλω εὐθυωρίαι ἐπὶ θάλασσαν", ὅ τε αὖ τοῖς Ἱερα-πυτνίοις καὶ Πραισίοις γενηθεὶς περι-
[ο]ρισμὸς γεγραμμένος οὕτως· ᵛ "οἱ δὲ ὅροι τᾶς χώρας ὡς ὁ Σέδαμνος ἐς Καρύμας ἐς τὰν δηράδα καὶ πέραν
ἐς τὰν στεφάναν καὶ περιαμπέτις ὡς ἁ στεφάνα καὶ εὐθυωρίαι ἐς Δορθάννας ἐπὶ τὸν λάκκον". τῶν δὲ προ-
ειρημένων ὁρίων σαφῶς διειργόντων τήν τε Ἰτανίων χώραν καὶ τὴν πρότερον μὲν οὖσαν Δραγμίων καὶ τὴν
Πραισίων, κατεχομένην δὲ νῦν ὑπὸ Ἱεραπυτνίων, τοῦ δὲ ἱεροῦ τοῦ Διὸς ἐκτὸς τῆς διαμφισβητουμένης
χώρας ὄντος καὶ περιοικοδομήμασιν καὶ ἑτέροις πλείοσι[ν ἀ]ποδεικτικοῖς καὶ σημείοις περιλα[μ]βανο-
μένου καθότι καὶ διὰ τῶν ἐπιδεικνυμένων ἡμῖν χωρογραφιῶν εὐσύνοπτον ἦν, πρ[ὸ]ς τούτοις ἀπεδείκνυον
Ἰτάνιοι καὶ δι' ἑτέρων πλειόνων γραμμάτων ὑπάρχουσαν τὴν διαμφισβητουμένην χώραν ἐνεργὸν καὶ οὐ-
χ, ὡς ἔφασαν Ἱεραπύτνιοι, ἱερὰν καὶ ἀγεώργητον, φανερὸν δὲ τοῦτο ἐγίνετο καὶ ἐκ τοῦ δόγματος καθ' ὃ ἐκρίνα-
μεν, τοῦ γραφέντος καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν ἐληλυθότων εἰς Κρήτην π[ρ]εσβευτῶν τῶν περὶ Κόιντον Φάβιον, οἵτινες ἑω-
ρακότες τό τε ἱερὸν καὶ τὸν περίβολον αὐτοῦ ἰδίοις σημε[ί]οις καὶ περι-οικοδομήμασιν περιεχόμενον, ἑωρα-
κότες δὲ καὶ τὴν χώραν τὴν ὅμορον τῷ ἱερῶι, ὑπὲρ μὲν ἱερᾶς χώρας οὐκ ἔγραψαν οὐθέν, καίτοιγε Ἱεραπυ-
τνίων ῥητῶς ὑπὲρ ἱερᾶς χώρας ἠξιωκότων τὴν σύγκλητον, Ἰτανίων δὲ περὶ χώρᾶς τῆς ἑαυτῶν τῆς καλουμέ-
νης Ἐλείας καὶ νήσου ἰδίας Λεύκης, γνόντες δὲ ὅτι ἡ παροροῦσα χώρα τῷ ἱερῶι οὐκ ἦν ἱερὰ οὐδὲ ἀγεώργητος, ὑ-
π[ὲ]ρ χώρας μόνον ἐφαίνοντο μνείαν πεποιημένοι, γράψαντες "ἵνα ἔχωσιν κατέχωσίν τε καρπίζωνταί τε," τοῦ
[κ]αρπίζεσθαι γραφομένου κατὰ χώρας γεγεωργημένης τε καὶ γεωργηθησομένης, ὅπερ ἐπὶ τῆς ἱερᾶς χώρ-
ας οὐκ ἦν ἐνδεχόμενον· ᵛ νόμοις γὰρ ἱεροῖς καὶ ἀραῖς καὶ ἐπιτίμοις ἄνωθεν διεκεκώλυτο ἵνα μηθεὶς ἐν τῷ ἱ-
ερῶι τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Δικταίου μήτε ἐννέμηι μήτε ἐναυλοστατῆι μήτε σπείρηι μήτε ξυλεύηι, καίτοιγε Ῥωμαίων,
ὅταν περὶ ἱερᾶς τινος χώρας διαφέρωνται, γραφόντων ῥητῶς, καθότι καὶ τὰ παρατεθέντα ἡμῖν ἐφ' ἑτέρων
δόγματα περιεῖχεν. τὸ δὲ πάντων μέγιστον καὶ ἰσχυρότατον τεκμήριον τοῦ ἐγνωσμένων τῶν καθόλου πρα-
γμάτων ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων ἐφ' ὁμολογουμένοις ἡμᾶς καὶ κεκριμένοις τὴν ψῆφον ἐπενηνοχέναι· Ἰτανίων γὰρ ἀξιωσάν-

των τὴν σύνκλητον ἵνα τὸ ἐνῳκοδομημένον ὑπὸ Ἱεραπυτνίων χωρίον ἐν τῆι
κρινομένηι χώραι καθαιρεθῆι ἡ σύν-
B κλητος ἐπέταξεν Λευκίῳ Καλοπ[ορνίῳ Λευκίου υἱῷ Πείσωνι στρατηγῷ ὅπως
[καθαιρ]εθῇ εἴ τι ἐνῳκοδόμηται, φανερῶς καὶ διὰ τοῦ τοιούτου - - - - - - - -
. . . . . ετων κρατούντων. ἀκολούθως δὲ τούτοις οἱ μὲν αὐτοὺς - - - - - - - -
90 . . . . . ντες Ἰτανίοις παρῆσαν. οἱ δὲ κατὰ πό⟨λε⟩ις ἐνγράφους . . . . .
. c . . . . π- - -
. . . . ἀποδεικνύντες ἄνωθεν τὰ διαμφισβητούμενα Ἰτα[νίων] γεγονότ[α - - - -]
. . . . των μέχρι τοῦ δηλουμένου διὰ τοῦ δόγματος γεγονέν[αι - - - - - -]
[ποιη]τῶν καὶ ἱστοριαγράφων ἀποδείξεις, ἃς καὶ αὐτοὶ ἡμ[ῖ]ν π . . . . . ες- - - -
. . . . . τους δικαιολογίᾳ· τά γε μὴν περὶ τῆς νήσου τῆς καλουμέ[νης Λεύκης - - -]
95 [. . . . τῶ]ν Ἱεραπυτνίων ἐξωμολογημένας εἶχεν τὰς ἀποδείξε[ις - - - -]
. . . . . τε τὴν νῆσον οὖσαν καὶ διὰ τὰ γεγενημένα περὶ αὐτοῦ - - - - - -
[τὴν Πτ]ολεμαϊκὴν οἰκίαν εἰς προστασίαν καὶ φυλακὴν ἑαυτοῖς κ . . . . . .
. . . . . κα- - - -
[ἰσχυρ]ίζεσθαι τὰς ἀποδείξεις ἐπιστολαῖς βασιλικαῖς, ἀντιγραφ[αῖς δὲ α]ὐτῶν - - -
[. . . τὴ]ν νῆσον πολλάκις στρατιωτῶν γραμμάτων τε ἀποστολαῖς . . . . το δοξ- - -
100 [. . . . τ]ὴν νῆσον φρουρίου, πρὸς δὲ τούτοις λογείαις τε σιτικαῖς ἃς ὁ λ
. . . . . καὶ ἐνε- - -
[ὑπ]ὲρ τῆς νήσου κατά τινων ὑπὸ Ἰτανίων γ⟨ε⟩γραμμέναις ὡς ἀπεδείκν[υον] δι᾽ά τε πλειόν[ων ἑτέρων χρηματις]-
[μῶν κ]αὶ διὰ λευκωμάτων ἅτινα τὰς ἐνιαυσίους εἶχεν τῶν τε[ταγμέν]ων διοι[κ]ήσεις. [πρὸς δὲ τοῖς]
[προειρ]ημένοις καὶ δι᾽ αὐτῶν ὧν αἵ τε λοιπαὶ πόλεις καὶ αὐτοὶ δὲ Ἰε[ραπ]ύτνιοι γεγρά[φ]ασι περὶ τῆς]
[προδε]δηλωμένης νήσου εὐσύνοπτον ἡμεῖν ὑπῆρχεν τὸ καὶ τὴν [προ]δεδηλωμένην νῆς[ον προγονικὴν]
105 [εἶναι] Ἰτανίων καὶ διακατειςχῆσθαι ὑπ᾽ αὐτῶν καὶ διὰ τῆς τῶν φίλω[ν αὐ]τῶν κα[λ]ῆς προν[οίας μέχρι τῆς - - -]
. . . . . ςίας καὶ μέχρι τοῦ συστάντος ἐν Κρήτῃ πολέμου ὧν ἀνα . . . . . ριν ἐπιμνησθ- - -
[ἔγνωμ]εν γὰρ τὴν τοῦ βασιλέως Πτολεμαίου προστασίαν καὶ [κεκυρωμέν]ην παρὰ τοῦ κοιν[οῦ τῶν Κρηταιέων]
[παρ᾽ ὧ]ν ἔλαβον εὐδόκησιν καθότι τὸ παρατεθὲν ἡμῖν διάγραμ[μα περι]εῖχεν, Ἰταν[ί]ο[ις Γορτύνιοι ἀπο]-
[στεί]λαντες ⟨ἐ⟩πιστολὴν διεσάφησαν ὅτι ἐπὶ τὴν νῆσον αὐτῶν τὴν [καλου]-μ[έ]νην Λεύκ[ην Πραίσιοι μέλλουσιν]
110 [ἐπέρχες]θαι, φανερὸν ποιοῦντ⟨ε⟩ς καὶ διὰ τοῦ τοιούτου τρόπου . . . . . ἐχον ἄλλας τὰ[ς - - -]

[. . Γο]ρτυνίων δὲ συνπαρόντων ἐπὶ τῆς κρίσεως Ἱεραπυτ[ν]ίοις, [παρετίθεν]το ἡμῖν Ἰτά[νιοι ἀποστα]-
[λεῖσαν] πρὸς ἑαυ[τ]οὺς πρότερον ὑπὸ Γορτυνίων ἐπιστολήν, δι' ἧ[ς] ἔ[κδη]λ̣[ο]ν ἅ[πασιν ἐγίνετο ὅτι]
[ἐπιμελῶς] προνοούμενοι Γορτύνιοι τοῦ κατὰ Ἰτανίους συμφέροντος ἐ[μήν]υ̣ον αὐτο[ῖς περὶ Πρα]ις[ίων ὅτι]
[περὶ τὴ]ν νῆσον αὐτῶν τὴν Λεύκην γίνονται ὡς κυριεύσοντες. . . . . τε ἡ ἐπιστολ[ὴ καὶ ἀνεγράφη, γε]-
115 [νομένης] ὑπ' οὐδενὸς ἀντιλογίας, ἐκρίναμεν δὲ καὶ αὐτῆς ἀ[ντίγραφον] καταχωρίσαι [τὸ ὑπογεγραμμένον·]
["Γ]ο̣ρτυνίων οἱ κόρμοι καὶ ἁ πόλις Ἰτανίων τοῖς κόρμοις καὶ [τ]ᾶι πόλ[ι] χαίρεν· πεπεισμ[ένοι ὑπ' ἀνδρός τινος]
[ὃς δεδ]ήλωκεν ὅτι οἱ Πραίσιοι οἰκονομόνται περὶ τᾶς Λεύκας ὡς [ἐπιστ]ρατίας γενομ[ένας, κρατῆσαι αὐ]-
[τᾶς, τάδε] ἐκρίναμεν ὑμῖν ἐπιμελίως ἀποστεῖλαι· ὑμὲν ἂ̣ν καλῶς ποή[σαιτε τ .]ς ἐν τῷ χωρίῳ - - - -
. . επ . . σην θέμ(ε)νοι παρορῶντέ(ς τε) εἰ χρείαν ἔχετε ἐν τὸ χωρίο[ν] ἐ[πιταδείω]ν· γεγράφ[αμεν οὖν ὑμῖν, οὐκ ὄν]-
120 των τούτων φίλων τῷ τε βασιλεῖ καὶ αὐτοῖς ὑμῖν, [δι]ὰ [πα]ντὸς ἐ[πιμε]λούμενοι κ[α]ὶ βω[λόμενοι ἀεὶ - - - -]
. ε . αι τῷ τε βασιλεῖ καὶ τοῖς τῶ βασιλέως φίλοις". Ἱεραπύτνιοι δ[ὲ ἔτι τῆ]ς ἀμφισβη[τ]ήσ[εως ἀντε]-
[χόμεν]οι καὶ φάσκοντες τὴν νῆσον ἑαυτῶν εἶναι προγονικὴν ακλη . . . . . ιτης τῶν - - - -
. . ς τε ἀρχούσης καὶ τῆς τῶν Στηλιτῶν φήσαντες πλοῖον εὖ . . . . . υ τὸμ πολεμ- -
. υκραι καταχθῆναι καὶ παρακαλοῦντες τὸς Ἰτανίους περὶ τούτων [. . . μν]είαν τιν[ὰ - - -]
125 . . αὐτοὶ Ἰτανίοις τὴν ὑπογεγραμμένην ἐπιστολὴν· "Ἱεραπυτνίων οἱ [κόσμοι κ]αὶ ἁ πόλις Ἰταν[ίων τοῖς]
[κόσ]μοις καὶ τᾶι πόλει χαίρεν· βέλτιον ὑπελάβομεν γράψαι ὑμῖν ὅπως εἰ διὰ [τὸ σ]υμβεβηκὸς· - - -
. . . καὶ Πραισίων κατᾶκται τὸ πλοῖον τὸ Κυδάνο(ρ)ος ἐκ τᾶς ὑμᾶς νάσω Λεύ[κας . . .]ν ἀδικούν· - - -
. . . σαιτε ἐπιστροφάν τινα ποησάμενοι περὶ τούτων ὅπως μηθὲν . . . . . ν ἀδικήσητε - -
. . . ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἁμές, εἴ τί κα συμβαίνῃ τινὶ ὑμῶν τοιοῦτο ἐν τᾷ ἁμ[ᾷ μηθενὶ] ἐπιτρέψομεν. [ἔρ]-
130 [ρωσθ]ε". τίς οὖν ἂν ἔτι προσδέξαιτο τὴν ὑπὸ Ἱεραπυτνίων κατὰ Στηλιτῶν . . . . . καιρὸν - - -
[. . . τῶ]ν προγονικὴν τὴν νῆσον ἑαυτῶν λεγόντων· ὅτε δὲ Πραισίων κατα . . . . . πο . υμεν - - -
[. . . π]ροειρημένων ἀποδείξεων ἰσχυροτέραν πίστιν τῆς τούτων α . . . . . εχη . . εν δι- - -

[. . . ἄν]θρωποι τὰς κατὰ τῶν τόπων ἔχουσι κυριείας ἢ παρὰ προγόνων
π[αραλαβόν]τες αὐτοὶ [ἢ πριάμενοι]
[κατ'] ἀργυρίου δόσιν ἢ δόρατι κρατήσαντες ἢ παρά τινος τῶν χρειςόν[ων
cχόντες· ὧν] οὐθὲν [φανερόν]
[ἐστι cυμβεβ]ηκὸς Ἱεραπυτνίοις· οὔτε γὰρ παρὰ προγόνων παρειληφότες
οὔ[τε . . . . . .]ητ- - -
. . . . . ἃc ο⟨ὔ⟩τε διὰ τοῦ ἀξιώματος ὑπογ[ρ]άψαντες οὔτε ὡς αὐτοὶ
ἐκ τῆς [νήcου . . . .]ονcανη- - -
[. . κατ' οὐ]δένα τῶν τρόπων, οὐδὲ μὴν κατὰ πολεμικὴν περίcταcιν ες . . . . .
. . ṭωταμ- - -
. . . . . η μ⟨η⟩δὲ γὰρ πεπολεμηκέναι τ[οῖc] Ἰτανίοις ἔφαcαν οὔτε μὴν
μ . . . . . ἡμεῖc - - -
. . . . . τούτων εὑρίcκοντο οὐδὲ ὑπ' αὐ[τῶν Ἰ]τανίων ἦν τι αὐτοῖc δεδο .
. . . . . νου δι- - -
. . . . . ὑπὸ πάντα τὸν τόπον· εἰ δὲ τῶν ἐναντίωμ μήτε γέγο[νεν]
μήτε - - - - -
- -

9: Μανάβωνος: Wilhelm. || 12: [μηδένα] ἡμῶν: Kern. || 13: [καὶ φιλανθρωπία]c: Kern. || 16–17: χρό|νω[ν αὐτοῖc ἐπ]ε̣λη⟨λ⟩υθυίας: Hiller von Gaertringen. Guarducci suggests [προc]ε̣λη⟨λ⟩υθυίας. || 18: ctοιχού[cης]: Böckh, Kern. || 20: [διατάξαντος] δὲ περὶ: Holleaux. || 33: ἀποκαταcτῆ[ν]αι: Xanthoudides. || 34: the Itanian stone reads HMEIN, the Magnesian one HMIN; cf. also lines 41, 57, 71. || 52: ἐνέcτα[το]: Viereck. || 52–53: εἶηcαν τῆι προ[τέραι, π]ρ[ὶν] ὁ πόλε|μος ἑαυτοῖc ἤρξατο: Viereck. || 63: περιαμπέτιξ: Halbherr. || 65: Guarducci suspects that Πραιcίοις was mistakenly inscribed for Ἰτανίοις. || 74: the Itanian stone reads Φάβιον Αἰτίλιον, the Magnesian one [Κό]ιντον Φάβιον οἵτινες ἑωρακότες. || 90: [cυνπαρό]ντες: Holleaux. || 103: [εἰρ]ημένοις: Kern. || 105–6: [τῆς πε|ριπετ]ε̣ίας: Holleaux. || 106: ἀνα[μνήcεως χά]ριν ἐπεμνηcθ[ῆμεν ἐν τῆι προεχθέcει]: Holleaux. || 108–9: Ἰτάν[ι]ο[ι ἐπεὶ αὐτοῖc ἀπο|cτεί]λαντες: Holleaux. || 110: τὰc π[όλεις]: Holleaux. || 113: cυμφέρον[τος ἐμήν]υcαν: Holleaux. || 114: [ἀνεγνώcθη] τε ἡ ἐπιcτολ[ὴ καὶ ἀντεγράφη]: Holleaux. || 120–21: [χαρί|ζ]ε[cθ]α[ι]: Holleaux. || 122: προγονικὴν [τε] καὶ [μὴ ἀμ]φιcβητουμέ[νην]: Holleaux. || 127–28: [καλῶc οὖν| ποιή]caιτε: Holleaux. Guarducci would prefer [ποή]caιτε. || 130: Cτηλιτῶν κατακ[ευ-]: Holleaux. || 132–33: [ἅπαντες μὲν| γὰρ ἄν]θρωποι: Dittenberger. || 133: [παραλαβόντες αὐτο]ὺc [ἢ πριάμενοι]: Holleaux.

Late in the second century B.C. a number of the poleis of eastern Crete settled disputes with each other through the employment of third-party negotiations or arbitration.[1] The Romans played a role in the promotion of peace on the island, a role that is particularly evident in the drawn-out struggles and prolonged efforts at peacemaking between Itanos and Hierapytna. The inscription found

1. See **164**, **165**, **32** Appendix.

at Itanos only (I) actually consists of a number of separate documents: a report of Hierapytnian ambassadors to the senate (lines 1–55); a *senatus consultum* (lines 55–74); orders from the Roman consul L. Calpurnius Piso (112 B.C.) for the arbitration between Itanos and Hierapytna to be referred to the Magnesians (lines 75–88); and a letter from Piso to the Hierapytnians, containing a summary of a senatorial decree about one aspect of the dispute (lines 89–97).[2] The second inscription (II), of which copies were found both at Itanos and Magnesia, contains the extensive (and fulsome!) report from the Magnesians on their efforts, in accordance with the Roman request, to arbitrate between the two states. In spite of the incomplete nature of these documents from Itanos and Magnesia, they provide us with a fair amount of information about the history of the hostility between Hierapytna and Itanos, and the efforts to resolve it. The dispute, as so often, was over territory claimed by both parties. In this case, the island of Leuke was a point of contention, as was a region adjoining the sanctuary of Diktaian Zeus.[3] The combined information provided by documents I and II produces the following scenario.[4]

Prior to the death of Ptolemy VI Philometor, Itanos, situated on the extreme eastern coast of Crete, was under pressure from its western neighbours, the Praisians. The Itanians turned to the Egyptian king for support in maintaining their hold on Leuke and the Diktaian sanctuary; a garrison was dispatched to aid Itanos. On the death of Philometor (145 B.C.), the Ptolemaic soldiers were recalled to Egypt, but the Itanians managed to defend their holdings on their own. War then broke out in Crete, and Praisos, which had acted as something of a buffer between Itanos and Hierapytna farther west, was destroyed by the latter. Subsequently a territorial dispute broke out between Hierapytna and Itanos, when Hierapytna adopted the land claims of the Praisians. The Roman Servius Sulpicius, probably the Sulpicius Galba who had been consul in 144, was sent to Crete to put an end to the war (141?). His final settlement was felt to be inequitable by the Itanians, who then turned to the senate in hopes of a more favourable judgement; Sulpicius was probably more concerned with the establishment of peace than the judicial investigation of territorial claims. The senate then passed on the matter, for the first time, to the city of Magnesia on the Maiander, a state that had demonstrated its close relations with Crete in the past in the context of an attempted arbitration between Knossos and Gortyn, and general pacification.[5] In 140 (during the consulship of C. Laelius),

2. See Guarducci III p. 109.

3. On the temple of Diktaian Zeus as an "Apple of Discord" among the east Cretan states, see Spyridakis pp. 49ff.; cf. also Bosanquet.

4. The following reconstruction of events is based chiefly on Guarducci's commentary on *IC* III.iv.9 and 10; see also Sherk, Spyridakis, Cary, Glossner, et al. for varying reconstructions.

5. See **58**, **127**.

the Magnesians gave their first judgement on the Hierapytna-Itanos dispute. This arbitration favoured the Itanians.

But the hostility between Hierapytna and Itanos continued, drawing in other states. Knossos, the friend and ally of Hierapytna, committed some undetermined acts of injustice against the Itanians; in turn, Itanos began an undeclared (ἀπαράνγελτος) war against the Hierapytnians. The Romans tried to intervene during the consulships of M. Aemilius (Scaurus) and M.' Acilius (Balbus) (115 and 114 B.C.), but they were unsuccessful. The Roman legate Quintus Fabius was sent to Crete, probably in 113, to review the state of affairs not only between Hierapytna and Itanos but also between Lato and Olos.[6] His mandate may in fact have been to effect a general settlement of the affairs of east Crete. The fighting involved Knossos and Gortyn as well; Knossos's allies were Itanos and Lato, while Gortyn's were Hierapytna and Olos.[7] Finally, in 112, the senate requested the consul, L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus, to put together a tribunal that would settle matters in Crete once and for all. The information and recommendations of Fabius's legation were to be taken into consideration for the eventual arbitration between Hierapytna and Itanos. But the final decision was passed on by Piso to the polis of Magnesia once again (112), the state that had arbitrated between Itanos and Hierapytna three decades before. The Magnesians were given 360 days in which to formulate a judgement; so the final decision, which was in favour of Itanos, may not have been delivered until 111 B.C.

When Piso delegated the task of arbitrating between the two Cretan states to Magnesia, he also passed along a fundamental regulation for that arbitration. The Magnesians were not, in effect, to make up their own minds once they had heard the arguments of the two sides. Rather, they were to determine a point of fact: who had been in possession of the land prior to the war settled by Sulpicius? Once they had made this discovery, they were to award the land to that party. This proviso was in keeping with Roman involvement in the Greek arbitral process. The criteria could vary (usually the senate requested that disputed territory be awarded to the state that had been in possession of it at time of entrance into Roman friendship or alliance), but the general pattern is clear enough: a basic framework was set down by the senate, and the detailed and time-consuming fact-finding of the arbitrating state operated within that framework.

The Roman request to Magnesia carried with it other stipulations. A court of thirty-one judges was requested, men who probably would be from the upper social or political classes (I, lines 84–85). In the event, as we learn from the

6. See **164**.

7. See Willetts, *Ancient Crete*, p. 156; id., *Aristocratic Society*, p. 240.

Magnesian report of their findings, the court consisted of only seventeen men.[8] A time limit was set for the rendering of a judgement, a limit of just under a year. The Roman consul also directed the Hierapytnians, who were evidently in possession of the disputed land adjoining the Diktaian sanctuary, to tear down any buildings they had constructed in that territory. This requirement was apparently independent of whatever decision the Magnesian tribunal might make, and it inevitably contributed to a prejudgement of the case in Itanos's favour, as the Magnesians themselves pointed out (II, lines 84f.).

Although the time limit of 360 days is among the more generous we find associated with cases of international arbitration, the Magnesian judges did not actually require all that time to carry out their duties. The inscription recording their judgement tells us that they heard all the testimony—documents recording boundary agreements, poetic and historical writings, letters from Ptolemy and other states—over the course of an entire day and most of a night. They appear to have pointed this out in an effort to impress all concerned with their enthusiasm, although it was certainly common enough to try to cover a trial within the course of a single day. The zeal of the Magnesian court comes across in other areas as well (including its flattery of the Romans). The sentence of the judges repeatedly stresses their desire and efforts to bring about a state of peace, harmony, and friendship between Itanos and Hierapytna. In fact, they at first tried to reconcile the two parties and avoid a formal arbitral judgement, only advancing to a vote when it became clear that feelings ran too high for friendly mediation. But it seems that, in spite of the desire of the judges to do the right thing, there was no autopsy, no visit to the territory in question, a very common procedure in boundary arbitrations. The hearing took place in Magnesia at the temple of Artemis Leukophryene.[9] The Magnesians wind up their wordy exposition (or at least the remaining portion of it) with some rather interesting observations on the rights of ownership (II, lines 132f.). It is pointed out that the Hierapytnians were unable to prove the justice of their claims based on any of the following criteria for possession of a territory: they had not received the land from their ancestors nor bought it with money nor conquered it by force nor been granted it by a more powerful state or dynast.

Cary and Sherk point to the Roman prejudgement in the matter of the Hierapytnian buildings on the disputed territory in their assessment of Roman "irresponsibility" in the case. "Rome's foreign policy in the period beginning with the Gracchi was not dictated by any honest effort to govern the provinces

8. Guarducci suggested that the remaining fourteen individuals were not approved by the Itanians and Hierapytnians.

9. The Milesians, who arbitrated the Spartan-Messenian land dispute c. 138 (159), also did not visit the territory in question. In that case, however, the sheer numbers of the court—six hundred men—offered a sufficient reason.

with justice or responsibility."[10] But it is possible that the directive to the Hierapytnians was merely meant to make them abide by their own declaration regarding the nature of the disputed land. It was part of the Hierapytnian argument that the disputed territory they claimed was actually sacred land; the Itanians had denied this. The Hierapytnians had seriously undercut their own argument by raising buildings on the so-called sacred land.

Cary was also critical of the Romans for reopening the case after the Magnesians had given their first decision in the matter. The senate "went behind the Magnesian award" in sending the embassy of Fabius to Crete to investigate matters afresh. This criticism surely arises from Cary's chronology of events; he believed that the first Magnesian tribunal was convoked as late as 114 or 113, in which case Fabius's embassy and the new investigation would have followed almost immediately. But if, as seems likely, there was actually a gap of twenty-eight years between the first and the second Magnesian tribunals (140–112 B.C.), then the Romans would have had any number of reasons to desire a fresh investigation, not the least of which were the appeals of the litigant parties and a prolonged state of war on the island. It is important to remember that hostilities in east Crete were widespread in this period, and that it was not only the Itanian-Hierapytnian dispute that the Romans were concerned with.

159. Miletos arbitrates between Messene and Sparta at the request of Rome (c. 138)

I: Tacitus *Annales* 4.43.3 (cf. 50).
II: An inscription from Olympia, inscribed on the base of the Nike of Paionios, dedicated by the Messenians. No dimensions given. The inscription includes three separate documents: a decree of Elis permitting the Messenians to inscribe the arbitral award of the Milesians at Olympia (A), a letter of the Milesians to Elis enclosing a sealed copy of the award (B), and the copy of the award (C).

R. Neubauer, *ArchZeit* 34 (1876) pp. 128–38, no. 16; G. Hirschfeld, *ArchZeit* 34 (1876) p. 230; R. Neubauer, *ArchZeit* 36 (1878) p. 104; de Ruggiero 16; Hicks 200; Berard 1, V; Michel 31; Dittenberger/Purgold, *IOlympia* 52; Dittenberger, *SIG*^{2} 314; Kolbe, *MDAI(A)* 29 (1904) p. 376; id., *IG* V.1, p. xv; *Dittenberger/Hiller von Gaertringen, *SIG*^{3} 683.

R. Weil, *MDAI(A)* 7 (1882) pp. 213f.; Sonne 51; Viereck 25; B. Haussoullier, *Études sur l'histoire de Milet et du Didymeion* (Paris, 1902) pp. 229, 247; Raeder 28, 3; Tod 1; Passerini, *Athenaeum*; Roebuck, Diss., pp. 106–7, 118–21; S. Accame,

10. Sherk, p. 85; see Cary, pp. 199–200. Crete was of course not a Roman province at this time.

with justice or responsibility."[10] But it is possible that the directive to the Hierapytnians was merely meant to make them abide by their own declaration regarding the nature of the disputed land. It was part of the Hierapytnian argument that the disputed territory they claimed was actually sacred land; the Itanians had denied this. The Hierapytnians had seriously undercut their own argument by raising buildings on the so-called sacred land.

Cary was also critical of the Romans for reopening the case after the Magnesians had given their first decision in the matter. The senate "went behind the Magnesian award" in sending the embassy of Fabius to Crete to investigate matters afresh. This criticism surely arises from Cary's chronology of events; he believed that the first Magnesian tribunal was convoked as late as 114 or 113, in which case Fabius's embassy and the new investigation would have followed almost immediately. But if, as seems likely, there was actually a gap of twenty-eight years between the first and the second Magnesian tribunals (140–112 B.C.), then the Romans would have had any number of reasons to desire a fresh investigation, not the least of which were the appeals of the litigant parties and a prolonged state of war on the island. It is important to remember that hostilities in east Crete were widespread in this period, and that it was not only the Itanian-Hierapytnian dispute that the Romans were concerned with.

159. Miletos arbitrates between Messene and Sparta at the request of Rome (c. 138)

I: Tacitus *Annales* 4.43.3 (cf. 50).
II: An inscription from Olympia, inscribed on the base of the Nike of Paionios, dedicated by the Messenians. No dimensions given. The inscription includes three separate documents: a decree of Elis permitting the Messenians to inscribe the arbitral award of the Milesians at Olympia (A), a letter of the Milesians to Elis enclosing a sealed copy of the award (B), and the copy of the award (C).

R. Neubauer, *ArchZeit* 34 (1876) pp. 128–38, no. 16; G. Hirschfeld, *ArchZeit* 34 (1876) p. 230; R. Neubauer, *ArchZeit* 36 (1878) p. 104; de Ruggiero 16; Hicks 200; Berard 1, V; Michel 31; Dittenberger/Purgold, *IOlympia* 52; Dittenberger, *SIG*^{2} 314; Kolbe, *MDAI(A)* 29 (1904) p. 376; id., *IG* V.1, p. xv; *Dittenberger/Hiller von Gaertringen, *SIG*^{3} 683.

R. Weil, *MDAI(A)* 7 (1882) pp. 213f.; Sonne 51; Viereck 25; B. Haussoullier, *Études sur l'histoire de Milet et du Didymeion* (Paris, 1902) pp. 229, 247; Raeder 28, 3; Tod 1; Passerini, *Athenaeum*; Roebuck, Diss., pp. 106–7, 118–21; S. Accame,

10. Sherk, p. 85; see Cary, pp. 199–200. Crete was of course not a Roman province at this time.

Il dominio romano (Rome, 1946) pp. 130, 135, 146; Robert, *REG* 1951, 25; H. Müller, *Milesische Volksbeschlüsse* (Göttingen, 1976) pp. 46f.; Gruen, pp. 98, 108; Burstein 80.

I: Tacitus *Annales* 4.43.3

Idem regis Antigoni, idem imperatoris Mummii iudicium; sic Milesios permisso publice arbitrio, postremo Atidium Geminum praetorem Achaiae decrevisse. ita secundum Messenios datum.

II: The Olympia inscription

Κρίcιc περὶ χώρας
Μεccανίοις καὶ Λακεδαιμονίο[ις.]
A πρεcβευτᾶν παραγενομένων παρὰ τᾶς πόλιος
τῶν Μεccανίων Μηνοδώρου τοῦ Διονυcίου,
'Απολλωνίδα τοῦ Νικάνδρου, Χαρητίδα τοῦ Δορ-
κωνίδα, καὶ τὰ γράμματα ἀποδόντων ἐν οἷc διεca-
φεῖτο ἀνανεωcαμένους τὰν ὑπάρχουcαν cυγγένει-
αν χα[ὶ] φιλίαν ταῖc πόλεcι ποθ' αὑτὰc διαλέγεcθαι ὅ-
πως ἐπιχωρήcει ἁ πόλις ἀναγραφῆμεν εἰc 'Ολυμπίαν
τὰγ κρ[ί]cιν τὰγ γενομέναν τᾶι πόλει αὐτῶν ποτὶ τὰμ
πόλι[ν] τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων περὶ χώρας, ἀποδόντων
δὲ τῶμ πρεcβευτᾶν καὶ ἐπιcτολὰμ παρὰ Μιληcίων
ἐcφραγιcμέναν, περιέχουcαν τὰν τε γεγε[ν]ημ[ένα]ν κρί-
cιν, διαλεγέντων δὲ κ[αὶ τῶ]μ πρεcβευτᾶν ἀκολ[ούθ]ως τοῖc γεγραμμένοιc· ἔδοξε τοῖc cυνέδροις, ἀπόκρι-
cιν δόμεν, διότι τὰν τε cυγγένειαν καὶ φιλίαν τὰν ὑπάρ-
χουcαν ποτὶ τὰμ πόλιν τῶμ Μεccανίων ἀνανεοῦν-
ταί τε καὶ ἐπὶ πλεῖομ προάξοντι, περί τε τοῦ ἐπιχω-
ρῆcαι ἀναγραφῆμεν εἰc 'Ολυμπίαν τὰγ κρίcιν τὰγ γεγενη-
μέναν τᾶι πόλει αὐτῶν ποτὶ τὰμ πόλιν τῶν Λακεδαι-
μονίων περὶ τᾶc χώρας ἐπὶ τοῦ δάμου τοῦ Μιληcίων,
διότι ἐπιχωροῦντι καθὼc ἁ πόλις τῶμ Μεccανίων
ἐγεγράφει καὶ οἱ πρεcβευταὶ παρεκάλεον· ἐπαινέcαι
δὲ καὶ τοὺc πρεcβευτὰc ἐπί τε τᾶι ἐνδαμίαι καὶ ἀνα-
cτροφᾶι ἃι πεποίηνται, δόμεν δὲ αὐτοῖc καὶ Φιλόνι-
κον τὸν ταμίαν ξένια τὰ μέγιcτα ἐκ τῶν νόμων,
καλέcαι δὲ αὐτοὺc καὶ τοὺc ἄρχοντας ἐπὶ τὰγ κοινὰν
ἑcτίαν.
B Μιληcίων οἱ πρυτάνειc καὶ οἱ ἱαρημένοι ἐπὶ τῆι φυλακῆι
'Ηλείων τοῖc ἄρχουcι καὶ τοῖc cυνέδροις χαίρειν· παρα-
γενομένωμ πρὸc ἁμᾶc πρεcβευτῶν παρὰ Μεccηνίων
Μηνοδώρου τοῦ Διονυcίου, Φιλοίτου τοῦ Κρατίου, καὶ
παρακαλούντων δοῦναι αὐτοῖc ἀντίγραφον πρὸc ὑ-
μᾶc τῆc γεγενημένηc κρίcεωc Μεccηνίοις τε καὶ

Λακεδαιμονίοις κατὰ τὸ δόγμα τῆς συγκλήτου, καὶ τῆς τε
βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου συγχωρησάντων τὰ προδεδηλ[ω]μέ-
να καὶ ἐπιταξάντων ἡμῖν δοῦναι αὐτοῖς τὴγ κρίσιν, ὑπο-
[τ]άξαντες αὐτὴν τῆι ἐπιστολῆι ἐδώκαμεν τοῖς πρεσβευ-
[τ]αῖς, ὅπως διακομίσωσιν αὐτὴμ πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐσφραγισμέ-
[νην] τῆι [δημ]οσίαι σφραγῖδι.
C ἐπὶ στεφανηφόρου Εἰρηνίου τοῦ Ἀσκληπιάδο[υ], μηνὸς
Καλαμαιῶνος δευτέραι, ὡς δὲ ὁ στρατηγὸς [ἔγρα]ψε Κόιν-
τος Καλιπόρνιος Γαΐου υἱὸς μηνὸς τετάρ[του καὶ δεκά]-
του καὶ ἡμέραι ἐνδεκάτηι κατὰ σελήνην ἀφ' ἧ[ς ἡμέρας τὸ]
δόγμα ἐγένετο, ἐκκλησία συνήχθη κυρία ἐν [τῶι θεά]-
τρωι ἐν τῆι προειρημένηι ἡμέραι, καθότι Λα[κεδαιμόνι]-
οι καὶ Μεσσήνιοι συνωμολογήσαντο, καὶ ἐπ[ε]κληρώθη
κριτήριον ἐκ παντὸς τοῦ δήμου τὸ μέγιστον ἐκ τῶν
νόμων, κριταὶ ἑξακόσιοι, καὶ εἰσήχθη ἡ κρίσις κατά τε
τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τοῦ προειρημένο[υ] στρατηγοῦ καὶ
κατὰ τὸ δόγμα τῆς συ[γκλ]ήτου π[ερὶ τοῦ] ἐπαμφιλλό-
[γου] τ̣ο[ῦ κ]α[τ]ὰ [Λ]ακ̣εδαι[μον]ί[ου]ς [τ]ε [καὶ Μεσσηνίους, ὁπό]-
τεροι ταύτην τὴν χώραν κατεῖχ[ον ὅτε Λεύκιος]
Μόμμιος ὕπατος ἢ ἀνθύπατος [ἐν ἐκείνηι τῆι ἐπαρ]-
χείαι ἐγένετο, ὅπως οὗτοι οὕτ[ως κατέχωσιν· καὶ δι]-
ηιρήθη αὐτοῖς τὸ ὕδωρ πρὸς τὴμ [μέτρησιν, ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ]
πρώτου λόγου ἑκατέροις μετρη[ταὶ Μιλήσιοι δεκα]-
πέντε, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ δευτέρου λόγο[υ μετρηταὶ Μιλήσιοι]
πέντε, καθότι καὶ αὐτοὶ εὐδόκησαν· [καὶ λε]ξάντων
πρὸς τὴν τήρησιν τοῦ ὕδατος παρὰ [μὲν Λ]ακεδαιμονί-
ων Εὐδαμίδα τοῦ Εὐθυκλέος, παρὰ δὲ Με[c]c̣ηνίων Νίκ⟨ι⟩-
ος τοῦ Νίκωνος, καὶ ῥηθέντων τῶν λόγω[ν ὑ]φ' ἑκατέ-
ρων, ἐκρίθη κατειcχῆcθαι ἡ χώρα ὑπὸ Μεcc̣[η]νίων ὅτε
Λεύκιος Μόμμιος ὕπατος ἢ ἀνθύπατος [ἐ]ν ἐκεί-
νηι τῆι ἐπαρχείαι ἐγένετο, καὶ ὅπως οὗ̣τ̣[οι] οὕτως
κατέχωcιν. τῶν ψήφων, αἷc ἔδοξεν κατειc[χῆcθαι]
ἡ χώρα ὑπὸ Μεccηνίων καὶ ὅπως οὕτοι οὕτω[c κα]-
τέχωcιν, πεντακόσιαι ὀγδοήκοντα τέccα-
ρεc· αἷc κατειcχῆcθαι ὑπὸ Λακεδαιμονίω[ν,]
δεκαέξ.

4: Ἀθανοδώρου: Neubauer, Hicks, de Ruggiero, Michel. Ἀθαναδώρου: Berard. || 30–31: παρα|γενομένωμ: Kolbe. || 33: δοῦναι αὐτοῖc: Neubauer, Hicks. || 39–40: ἐcφραγιcμέ|[ναν]: Neubauer. || 42: cτρατηγὸc [Ῥωμαίων]: Neubauer, Hicks. || 43–44: [πέμπ]|του?: Neubauer, Hicks. || 47: κ[αὶ ἐκ]ληρώθη: Neubauer, Berard, Hicks, de Ruggiero, Michel. ἀπ[ε]κληρώθη: Dittenberger/Purgold, *SIG*^{2}, Kolbe. || 51–52: ἐπ' Ἀμφιάλο[υ τοῦ| - - ἐπὶ τούτῳ]: Neubauer, Hicks. ἐπ' Ἀμφίλλο[υ τοῦ| - - ἐπὶ τούτωι]: Berard. ἐπ' Ἀμφίλλο[υ -]: de Ruggiero, Michel. ἐπ' ἀμφιλλο[γ|ίᾳ . . . . Λ]α[κε]δαι[μον]ί[οι]c [τ]ε [καὶ Μεccηνίοις]: Dittenberger/Purgold, *SIG*^{2}. ἐπ' ἀμφιλλο[γίαι διccᾶι Λ]α[κε]δαι[μον]ί[οι]c [τ]ε [καὶ Μεccηνίοις]: Kolbe. || 53: [πρὶν Λεύκιος]: Neubauer. || 55–56: [καὶ διεμ|ετ]ρήθη: Neubauer, Berard,

Hicks. || 56: πρὸc τὴν [τήρηcιν]: Neubauer, Berard, Hicks, de Ruggiero. πρὸc τὴν [ἄμιλλαν]: Michel. || 57: μετρη[τῶν Μιλητίων δέκα]: Neubauer, Berard, Hicks. || 58: [μετρητῶν Μιλητίων]: Neubauer, Berard, Hicks. || 61–62: [Νίκων]|oc: Berard. Νίκ⟨ων⟩|oc: Hicks, Dittenberger/Purgold, de Ruggiero, Michel, *SIG*^{2}, Kolbe.

The history of Sparta's dispute with Messenia over the Dentheliatis was long-standing. Since we first hear of it in connection with a decision made by Philip II in 338/7, we can conjecture that the hostility over the land, and the temple of Artemis that it contained, went back as far as 369 and Sparta's loss of Messenia. Sparta had lost the contest several times in the past; perhaps Roman support of its cause in the Achaian War led Sparta to try again. Mummius, according to Tacitus, awarded the land to Messenia in 146/5; but it is unlikely that this was by a regular arbitral process, of the kind we find reflected in the testimonia for the present case. It was a few years after Mummius's consulship, around 138, that the senate was asked to arbitrate the Messenian-Spartan land dispute.[1] The Romans in turn passed the request along to another Greek state, that of Miletos in Asia Minor, but without giving it carte blanche.[2] The Milesians agreed to the request, and to the Roman proviso for the settlement of the dispute. The *senatus consultum* asked the Milesians simply to determine a point of fact: which of the two states had been in possession of the land when Mummius was consul or proconsul in Greece? Once this point was clarified, the land was to be awarded to that party. This too was a common Roman response. It certainly made decisions easier for the senate; and the onus of listening to lengthy evidence could be delegated to a Greek state.

Tacitus merely informs us that the Milesians granted the Dentheliatis to Messene. Although the inscription does not mention the disputed land by name, there is no doubt that Tacitus and the documents from Olympia deal with the same issues; this is one of the rare cases for which we have both epigraphic and literary evidence. The inscription was carefully engraved on the base of the impressive Nike of Paionios and is a striking example of the practice of publication in an international sanctuary.[3] It is document C (lines 41–70) that tells us most about the Milesian procedure in this case. The judgement was carried out in Miletos itself, by the largest court definitely attested in any case of interstate arbitration. A full assembly of the people was convened, with the agreement of the Spartan and Messenian representatives. Lots were then drawn to make up a panel of six hundred judges, taken from the citizen population at large.[4] The Spartan and Messenian advocates spoke

1. The date is based on the appearance of Q. Calpurnius (probably Piso) as praetor.

2. Around the same time the Romans asked Miletos's neighbour Magnesia to arbitrate the dispute between Hierapytna and Itanos (**158**).

3. See the drawing at *IOlympia* 52.

4. According to the Milesians, this was the largest tribunal convenable by law; probably the law referred to was one that dealt primarily with internal trials and arbitrations.

before this tribunal, in a fashion familiar from other examples of arbitral and general court procedure; each side was given 15 measures of the water clock for its first presentation, and 5 for its second.[5] Since the primary purpose of the Milesian court was to determine who had been in possession of the land as recently as 146/5, it seems unlikely that the evidence offered went back quite as far as the return of the Herakleidai, as it did in the arbitration before Tiberius.

Both Spartans and Messenians had agreed to a democratic court, rather than a small court of experts. For the Spartans at least, it proved disastrous. The court found overwhelmingly in Messene's favour: 584 to 16. This would scarcely be surprising if, as Tacitus implies, Mummius himself had assigned the land to Messene.[6] But it was obviously not the response that Sparta desired. As it had done during the Hellenistic age, Sparta continued to seek redress of the situation. In later years it was even (occasionally) successful. The Spartans received favourable decisions on the Dentheliatis from Julius Caesar and Marc Antony (Tac. *Ann.* 4.43.1). Nevertheless, the last arbitration reported by Tacitus tells us that the situation was reversed yet again: the emperor Tiberius decided in favour of Messene (4.43.3). But even this Roman decision was not the end of the conflict. A boundary delimitation of A.D. 78 between Sparta and Messene suggests that the two states continued to dispute the ownership of the Dentheliatis without end.[7]

160. The Roman senate upholds the Rhodian judgement between Priene and Samos (shortly before 135 and 135)

Three inscriptions from the temple of Athena Polias in Priene.

I: A *senatus consultum*; h: 0.50 m; w (max.): 0.59 m.

Böckh, *CIG* 2905 G.7; LeBas/Waddington 199; Viereck XIII; Hicks, *BMus* 404; *Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene* 40; Sherk 10A.

II: A *senatus consultum*. Fragmented; see *IPriene* for epigraphic details.

Böckh, *CIG* 2905 F.6; LeBas/Waddington 195–98; Viereck XIV; de Ruggiero 9; Berard 39, XIII; Hicks, *BMus* 405; Dittenberger, *SIG*^{2} 315; *Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene* 41; Dittenberger/Hiller von Gaertringen, *SIG*^{3} 688; Sherk 10B.

5. Cf. **21**.
6. See **150** for a discussion of the nature of Mummius's decision.
7. *IG* V.1.1431.

before this tribunal, in a fashion familiar from other examples of arbitral and general court procedure; each side was given 15 measures of the water clock for its first presentation, and 5 for its second.[5] Since the primary purpose of the Milesian court was to determine who had been in possession of the land as recently as 146/5, it seems unlikely that the evidence offered went back quite as far as the return of the Herakleidai, as it did in the arbitration before Tiberius.

Both Spartans and Messenians had agreed to a democratic court, rather than a small court of experts. For the Spartans at least, it proved disastrous. The court found overwhelmingly in Messene's favour: 584 to 16. This would scarcely be surprising if, as Tacitus implies, Mummius himself had assigned the land to Messene.[6] But it was obviously not the response that Sparta desired. As it had done during the Hellenistic age, Sparta continued to seek redress of the situation. In later years it was even (occasionally) successful. The Spartans received favourable decisions on the Dentheliatis from Julius Caesar and Marc Antony (Tac. *Ann.* 4.43.1). Nevertheless, the last arbitration reported by Tacitus tells us that the situation was reversed yet again: the emperor Tiberius decided in favour of Messene (4.43.3). But even this Roman decision was not the end of the conflict. A boundary delimitation of A.D. 78 between Sparta and Messene suggests that the two states continued to dispute the ownership of the Dentheliatis without end.[7]

160. The Roman senate upholds the Rhodian judgement between Priene and Samos (shortly before 135 and 135)

Three inscriptions from the temple of Athena Polias in Priene.

I: A *senatus consultum*; h: 0.50 m; w (max.): 0.59 m.

Böckh, *CIG* 2905 G.7; LeBas/Waddington 199; Viereck XIII; Hicks, *BMus* 404; *Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene* 40; Sherk 10A.

II: A *senatus consultum*. Fragmented; see *IPriene* for epigraphic details.

Böckh, *CIG* 2905 F.6; LeBas/Waddington 195–98; Viereck XIV; de Ruggiero 9; Berard 39, XIII; Hicks, *BMus* 405; Dittenberger, *SIG*^{2} 315; *Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene* 41; Dittenberger/Hiller von Gaertringen, *SIG*^{3} 688; Sherk 10B.

5. Cf. **21**.
6. See **150** for a discussion of the nature of Mummius's decision.
7. *IG* V.1.1431.

III: Record of a Mylasan (?) boundary commission. Fragmented; see *IPriene* for epigraphic details.

LeBas/Waddington 200–204, 206–7; Hicks,*BMus* 406–8; *Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene* 42 (rev. ed.; cf. *IPriene*, p. 310).

Sonne 20; Raeder 34, pp. 73–74; Tod 63 (I), 64 (II), 65 (III); Magie, *Buckler Studies*, p. 182; id., *RRAM*, vol. 1, p. 114; vol. 2, p. 965; Johnson et al., *ARS* 41a; Robert, *REG* 1976, 131; Walbank, *Comm*, vol. 3, p. 164. See also the bibliographies in **26**, **74**, **99**.

I: *Senatus consultum* (pre-135 B.C.)

[- ἐc]τιν· καὶ περ[ὶ ὧν οἱ]
[ἀποσταλέντες παρὰ Πριηνέων πρεσβευταὶ ἄνδρες καλοὶ καὶ] ἀγαθοὶ καὶ φίλοι πα[ρὰ δήμου]
[καλοῦ καὶ ἀγαθοῦ καὶ φίλου λόγους ἐποιήσαντο συμμαχί]ạν τε ἀνενεώσαντο, [καὶ πε]-
[ρὶ τῆς χώρας ἣν λέγουσιν ἑαυτῶν γενέσθαι πρὶν ἐληλυ]θέναι εἰς ἐκείνην τὴν χώραν Μ[άν]-
[λιον καὶ τοὺς δέκα πρεσβευτάς, ὅπως ταύτην ἔχ]ωσιν· καὶ ὅσα κριτήρια κεχριμένα ἐ{ι}c[τὶ]
[περὶ ταύτης τῆς χώρας, ὅπως ταῦτα πάντα ἀναν]ẹωθῇ καὶ φιλανθρώπως {τε}αὐτοῖς ἀποκρι-
[θῇ· ἔδοξεν· καὶ ὅσα Πριηνεῖς λέγουσιν ἐπὶ το]ιαῦτα ἔτη κατέχειν ἐκείνης τῆς χώρας,
[περὶ τούτων οὕτω καθὼς καὶ Ῥόδιοι κ]ε[κ]ρίκασιν, οὕτως δοκεῖ εἶναι· εἰ δέ τί ἐστιν
[ἐναντίον ὧν ὡρισμένα ὑπὸ Ἀντι]γόνου ἐστίν, οὕτως φαίνεται δεῖν εἶναι· ξενιά τε αὐ-
[τοῖς ἀποστεῖλαι τὸν ταμίαν ἕως ἀπὸ νό]μων σηστερτίων ἑκατὸν εἴκοσι πέντε καθ' ἑκάστην
[πρεσβείαν], καθὼς ἂν αὐτῶι ἐκ τ[ῶν δημοσίων πραγμάτων βέλτιστα? φ]αίνη-
[τ]αι· ẹ̣̈δοξε[ν].

1–2: περ[ὶ ὧν Cά]μιοι - - - πρεσβευταὶ λόγους ἐποήσαντο ἄνδρες κτλ]: Viereck. || 2: [ἀφικόμενοι]: Hicks. || 3: [χάριτα φιλίαν συμμαχί]αν: Viereck. || 5: εἰc: Viereck. εἰc[ὶ]: Sherk. || 6–7: ἀποκρι|[θῆναι]: Viereck. ἀποκρί|[νασθαι]: Hicks. || 10: [nom. eius qui senat. cons. τὸν ταμίαν ἀποστεῖλαι κελεύση ἕως ἀπὸ νό]μων: Viereck. || 11: [πρεσβείαν οὕτως]: Viereck.

II: *Senatus consultum* (135 B.C.)

Δόγμα τὸ κομισθὲν παρὰ τῆς cυ[γκλήτου Ῥωμαίων ὑπὸ τ]ῶν ἀποσταλέντων πρεσβευτῶν ὑπὲρ τῶν πρὸς Cαμίους·
Cερούιος Φολούιος Κοΐντου υἱός, cτ[ρατηγὸς ὕ]πατος, τῆι cυγκλήτωι cυνεβουλεύcατο ἐγ κομετίωι πρὸ ἡμε-

ρῶν πέντε εἰδυιῶν Φεβροαρίων· γραφομ[ένωι παρ]ῆσαν Λεύκιος Τρεμήλιος Γναίου Καμελλία, Γάϊος Ἄννιος Γαΐου
Καμελλία,˅ Λεύκιος Ἄννιος Λευκίου Πο[λλία· πε]ρὶ ὧν Σάμιοι πρεσβευταὶ Τηλέμαχος Μάτρωνος, Λέων Λέοντος,
ἄνδρες κα[λοὶ κ]αὶ ἀγαθοὶ καὶ φίλοι παρὰ δ̣ήμ̣ο[υ καλοῦ] καὶ ἀγαθοῦ καὶ φίλου συμμάχου τε ἡμετέρου ˅ λόγους ἐποήσαντο
κατὰ πρό[c]ωπον πρὸς Πριην[ε]ῖc π[ερὶ χ]ώ̣ρας [καὶ ὁρίων, ὅπως ὦcιν] καθὼς Γναῖο{ι}c Μάνλιος καὶ οἱ δέκα πρεσβευταὶ διέταξαν
[μετὰ τὸν πρὸς Ἀντίοχον πόλεμον· καὶ περὶ ὧν Πριηνεῖς πρεσβευτὰι - - - - -]ρου,˅ Ἀνα[ξ]ι- - - -,
[Z]ηνόδοτος Ἀρ[ιστάρχου, ἄ]νδρες καλοὶ καὶ ἀγαθοὶ καὶ φίλοι π[αρὰ δήμου κα]λοῦ καὶ ἀγ[αθοῦ] συμμάχου τε [ἡμετέρου]
λόγους ἐποήσα[ντο κατ]ὰ πρόcω[πον πρ]ὸc Cαμίου[c] περὶ χώρας καὶ περὶ ὁρίων, ὅπως οὕτω[c ὦ]cιν καθὼς ὁ δῆμος ὁ Ῥοδίων
ἑκατέρων θελόν[τ]ων ἔκρινεν· περὶ τούτου τοῦ πράγματο[c ἀποκρι]θῆναι οὕτως ἔδοξεν· ἡμῖν οὐκ εὐχ[ερ]ές {εἶναι}ἐcτιν μεταθεῖναι ἃ ὁ δῆμος ὁ Ῥοδίων ἑκατέρων θελόντων κέκρι[κε κ]αὶ ὁρ[ιcμὸν] πεποιήται, {ΤΟΥ}⟨ἵνα⟩ μ[ὴ] τούτωι τῶι κρίματι καὶ τού[τοις τοῖc ὁρίοις] ἐμμείνωcιν· τ[ούτ]ωι τε τῶι κρίματι καὶ τού[τοις τοῖc ὁρίοις ἐμμένει]ν ἔδοξεν· τούτοις τε ξένιον εἰc ἑκάcτην πρεcβείαν ἕωc ἀπὸ cηcτερτίων νόμων ἑκατὸν εἴκοcι [Cερούιος Φ]ολ[ο]ύιος Κοΐντου ὕπατος τὸν ταμίαν ἀποcτεῖλαι κε[λευcάτω, καὶ πραξάτω] καθὼς ἂν αὐτῶι ἐκ [τ]ῶν δημοcίων πραγμάτων [καὶ τῆc ἰδίας πίc]τε[ως φαίνηται]. ἔδοξεν.

7: [μετὰ τὸν Ἀντιόχειον πόλεμον]: Hicks, Berard. || 8: [Z]ηνόδοτος Ἀρ[τέμωρος]: Sherk. || 11: ὁρ[ιcμὸν] πεπόνηται: Hicks, Viereck, de Ruggiero, Berard. || 13 ἀποcτεῖλαι κε[λεύcῃ]: Hicks, Viereck, de Ruggiero. || 14: καθὼc ἂν αὐτῷ (ἐκ [τ]ῶν δημοcίων πραγμάτων [βέλτιcτα φαίνη]τ[αι]. ˅Εδοξεν.): Hicks.

III: Report of the Mylasan (?) boundary commission

Ἐπὶ cτεφανηφ[όρ]ου Ἡγήμονος τοῦ Οὐλιάδου, [Ληναιῶν]ος ἕκτηι ἀπιόντος, [ὡc . . . .]εῖc ἄγουcιν, ὡc δὲ Cάμιοι, ἐπὶ δημιουργοῦ Θεοδώρου
τοῦ Δημητρίο[υ], Ἀνθεcτηριῶνος τεccαρεcκαιδεκάτηι, πρὸc [δὲ τὴν μαντείαν?] ἕκτῃ, ὡc δὲ Πριηνεῖc ἐπὶ cτεφανηφόρου Θραcυβούλου τοῦ μεθ' Ἡγέλοχον
Ἀνθεcτηριῶνος πέμπτηι ἀπιόντος, τάδε [Cαμίοις καὶ Πριηνεῦcιν ἐκρίθη? ὑπὸ - - - - - - - - τοῦ δεῖνος τοῦ - -]ήμον[ος],
Μενύλλου το[ῦ] Καλλιμάχου, Δ[- - - - τοῦ - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
Ἀρτεμιδώρο[υ] τοῦ Εὐβούλου τοῦ Διονυcίου, Δίο[υ τοῦ] Λέοντο[c, - - - - - - - οὓc ἀπέδειξεν ὁ - -έων]
[δ̣ῆ]μος κριτὰ̣[c κα]τὰ τὸ τῆc [cυν]κλήτου διο . . . . . ., οἳ c- - - - - - - - - - - - -
[- - - - - - - - - - ἐπελθόντες ἐπὶ τοὺc ἀ]μφιcβητουμένους τόπους, ἐφ' ο[ἷc πλείονας? cυνε]βουλε[ύθη]cαν? ἡμέρας· τῆc δὲ cυνο[μο]-

[λογίας γενομένης πάντως δικαίαν εἶναι ἔκριναν τὴν] Ῥοδίων κρίσιν τε καὶ
ὁροθεσίαν. ἡμεῖς θεωρήσαντες διὰ τὰς ἰδιωτικὰς γειτνι-
[άσεις πολλοὺς ἐκκεκόφθαι τῶν ὅρων ἢ ἠφανίς]θαι διὰ τὸν χρόνον, ἐκ τῶν
σῳζομένων ὅρων τε καὶ ἐνκολαμμάτων καὶ ἐκ τῶν
[ἀναφερομένων ποταμῶν καὶ ὀρῶν? καὶ λόφων καὶ β]ουνῶν καὶ ῥάχεων καὶ
ὀλισθημάτων {καὶ τῶν σῳζομένων ὅρων}ἐφηρμόσαμεν τὴν
[τῶν Ῥοδίων ὁροθεσίαν, καθ' ἥντινα καὶ παρ' ἀμφοτέ]ροις τοῖς δήμοις τὰ
πράγματα παρετέθη· ᾗ καὶ κατακολουθήσαντες ἀποκατεστή-
[σαμεν τοὺς ὅρους ἐμφανέσι χρώμενοι καὶ ἀφ]θάρτοις σημείοις, οἷς κατη-
ναγκάσαμεν ὡς ἔδει τὴν ὁροθεσίαν ἐπιτελέσαι τοὺς
[ἡμφισβητηκότας, τῇ τε πατρίδι τῇ προχειρ]ισαμένῃ καὶ τοῖς ἰδίοις βίοις καὶ
τοῖς μεταπεμψαμένοις δήμοις ἀκόλουθον τηρή-
[σαντες τὴν αἵρεσιν, καὶ τῶν ἐγδίκων πᾶσαν προσεν]εγκαμένων σπουδὴν καὶ
φιλοτιμίαν καὶ τὸν ἀγῶνα διαθεμένων ὡς ἐ-
[πέβαλλεν ἀνδράσι καλοῖς καὶ ἀγαθοῖς καὶ ἀγωνίζο]μένοις ὑπὲρ πατρίδος·
παρὰ μὲν Σαμίων Θεοδότου τοῦ Ἑρμίππου,
[τοῦ δεῖνος τοῦ δεῖνος, τοῦ δεῖνος τοῦ δεῖνος . .,] φύσει δὲ Ἀνδροσθένου,
Σωσιστράτου τοῦ Σωσιστράτου, Ἀδηρίτου τοῦ Εὐκλείους,
[τοῦ δεῖνος τοῦ δεῖνος, τοῦ δεῖνος τοῦ δεῖνος, Θρασ]υλέοντος or —-ο]υ,
Λέοντος τοῦ Ὑψιθέμιδος, Διογένους τοῦ Διογένου, καὶ τοῦ προσαποδειχ-
θέντος κατὰ τὸ ψήφισμα
[γραμματέως τοῦ δεῖνος τοῦ δεῖνος· παρὰ δὲ Πριην]έων Ἀριστογένους τοῦ
Ἀριστογένου, Θράσυος τοῦ Χαριδήμου, Ἡρακλείτου τοῦ Θεοδώρου,
[τοῦ δεῖνος τοῦ δεῖνος, - - - - - - - - - - - -]ου τοῦ Εὐφάντου, Ἀρτέμωνος τοῦ
Μεγιστείου, Λυσιμάχου τοῦ Ἀρτεμιδώρου,
[τοῦ δεῖνος τοῦ δεῖνος, τοῦ δεῖνος τοῦ Διο]σκουρίδου, Σωφίλου τοῦ Ἐπι-
νίκου, Διονυσίου τοῦ Ἀμινίου, Ἀττάλου τοῦ
[δεῖνος, τοῦ δεῖνος τοῦ δεῖνος, τοῦ δεῖνος τοῦ Μοσ]χίωνος, Ἀκρισίου τοῦ
Ἀπολλωνίου, Μηνοδότου τοῦ Μηνοφίλου, Ἡρακλείτου
[τοῦ δεῖνος, τοῦ δεῖνος τοῦ δεῖνος, παρόντων καὶ τῶν πρ]εσβευτῶν, παρὰ μὲν
Σαμίων Κριτόλεω τ[οῦ] Ἡροκρίτου, [Ἀθηνο?]δώρου τοῦ - - - -

[two blocks missing]

[- - - - - - - -ἀπ]ὸ δὲ τούτου καταβάντες εἰς τὴν κοιλάδα τὸν μὲν ὑπὸ Ῥοδίων
τεθέντα ὅρον ὑπὲρ τὴν λίμνην οὐχ εὕρομεν,
αὐτοὶ δ' ἐθήκαμεν, [καταλ]ιπόντες καὶ αὐτοὶ τὴν λίμνην ἐν τῇ Πριηνίδι· ἀπὸ
δὲ τούτου ἐπ' εὐθείας δι[αβ]άντων [βου]νίον καλούμενον ΑΝΔΡΕΚΑΣ
[. . . . τὸν μὲν ὑπὸ Ῥοδίω]ν τεθέντα ὅρον ἐπὶ τὸ μετέωρον ὀλίσθημα τὸ
ἀργιλῶδες οὐχ εὕρομεν, αὐτοὶ δ' ἐ[θήκαμεν· παρὰ δὲ τὴν γωνί]αν? ἐπ'
εὐθείας
[πορευομένων τὸν μὲν] ὑπὸ Ῥοδίων τεθέντα ὅρον οὐχ εὕρομεν, αὐτοὶ δὲ
ἐθήκαμεν· ἀπ[ὸ δὲ τούτου - - - - - - - - - - -] ὑπέρκειται
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - τὸν μὲν ὑπὸ Ῥοδίων τεθέντα ὅρον οὐχ εὕρομεν, α[ὐτοὶ
δὲ ἐθήκαμεν· ἀπὸ δὲ τούτου - - - - -β]αινόντων
[- τοῦ] ὅρου ἐν ΑΙΣ
[- - - - - - - - - τ]ὸν δρυ[μ]ώδη λόφ[ον] τὸν ὑπὸ [Σαμίων μὲν καλούμενον -
- -, ὑπὸ Πριηνέων δὲ - - - - - - τὸν ὑπὸ]

῾Ροδίων ἐπικολαφθέντα ὅρον εὕρ(ο)μεν· ἀπὸ δὲ τούτου καταβαίνοντε[c εἰς τὴν φάρανγα καὶ πορευόμενοι ἐπὶ τὸν ποταμὸν καὶ ἀναβαίνοντες]
ἕως τοῦ τόπου ὃc ἦν ὑπὲρ τὸν ποταμὸν {καὶ}-τὸν μὲν ὑπὸ ῾Ροδ[ίων τεθέντα ὅρον οὐχ εὕρομεν, αὐτοὶ δ' ἐθήκαμεν· ἀπὸ δὲ τούτου - - - - ἐν τῶι]
cυνκοίλῳ τὸν μὲν ὑπὸ ῾Ροδίων ἐπικολαφθέντα ὅρον οὐχ εὕρομεν, [αὐτοὶ δὲ ἐπεκολάψαμεν· ἀπὸ δὲ τούτου - - - - - - ἀναβάντες]
ἐπὶ τὴν ῥάχιν τὸν μὲν ὑπὸ ῾Ροδίων ἐπικολαφθέντα ὅρον οὐχ ε[ὕρομεν, αὐτοὶ δὲ ἐπεκολάψαμεν· ἀπὸ δὲ τούτου πορευομένων ἐπὶ τὸν ἀπέναντι]
βουνόν, αὐτῶι τῶι βουνῶι ὅρωι ἐχρηcάμεθα, καθότι καὶ ῾Ρόδιοι· [ἀπὸ δὲ τούτου - - - - - - - - τὸν μὲν ὑπὸ ῾Ροδίων ἐπι]-
κολαφθέντα ὅρον οὐχ εὕρομεν, αὐτοὶ δὲ ἐπεκολάψαμεν· ἀπὸ δὲ [τούτου - - - -τὸν μὲν ὑπὸ ῾Ροδίων ἐπικολαφθέντα ὅρον οὐχ εὕρομεν,]
αὐτοὶ δὲ ἐπεκολάψαμεν· πορευομένων δὲ ἐπ' εὐθήας εἰc τὸν [- - - - - - τὸν ὑπὸ ῾Ροδίων ἐπικολαφθέντα ὅρον εὕρομεν· ἀπὸ δὲ]
τούτου πορευομένων τῆι ῥάχει ἐπὶ τὸν ἀπέναντι βουνὸν τὸ[ν ὑπὸ ῾Ροδίων - - - ὅρον - - - -· ἀπὸ δὲ τούτου κατὰ τὴν ῥά]-
χιν πορευομένων ὡc παραφέρει ἡ cτεφάνη ἐπὶ τὴν καταλήγ[ουcαν τοῦ βουνοῦ τὸν μὲν ὑπὸ ῾Ροδίων τεθέντα ὅρον οὐχ εὕρομεν, αὐτοὶ δὲ ἐθή]-
καμεν, ἀπολείποντες τὴν ἔπαυλιν τὴν ἐπὶ τῆc cτεφάνηc καὶ τ[- - - - - - - ἐν τῆι Πριηνίδι, τ- - δὲ - - - - - - -]
ἐν τῆι Caμίαι· ἀπὸ δὲ τῆc γωνίαc ἐπ' εὐθείαc ὑπὸ τὸ ὄροc εἰc τὸ ὀ[λίcθημα? - - -]·
ἀπὸ δὲ τούτου ἐπ' εὐθείαc εἰc τὸν πέτρον τὸν μέγαν τὸν ἐν τῶ[ι - - - - - - - - - - -· ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ]
πέτρου εἰc ὀρθὸν ἐπὶ τὴν ἀπέναντι ὀφρὺν ἐλθόντεc τὸν μὲν [ὑπὸ ῾Ροδίων ἐπικολαφθέντα ὅρον οὐχ εὕρομεν, αὐτοὶ δὲ ἐπεκολάψαμεν· ἀπὸ δὲ τῆc]
ὀφρύοc ἐπ' εὐθείαc εἰc τὸν ποταμὸν καταβαίνοντεc τὸν καλ[ούμενον ὑπὸ μὲν Caμίων - - - -, ὑπὸ δὲ Πριηνέων - - - - - αὐτῶι τῶι ποτα]-
μῶι ὅρωι ἐχρηcάμεθα, [καθότι καὶ] ῾Ρόδιοι· ἀφ' οὗ ἐξέcτω Caμίο[ιc κατέχειν τὴν πέραν τοῦ ποταμοῦ χώραν - - - - - - - -, Πριηνεῦcι δὲ]
τὴν ἐξουcίαν ἐδώ[καμεν μέχρι τ]οῦ [προ]γεγραμμένου ποτα[μοῦ - - - - - - - - -]
[- - - - - - - ἐλθόντεc ἐπὶ τὸν ποταμὸν τὸν] ὁριζοντα τὰ πρὸc Βῆccαν ἐχρηcάμ[ε]θα ὅ[ρ]ωι αὐτῶι τῶι ποταμῶι τῶι ⟨ῥ⟩έοντι διὰ τῆc μεγά[λης]
[φάρανγοc, οὗ ἐπὶ τῶν ὑπερκειμένων λό]φων ἐcτὶν τὸ ῾Ηράκλειον, καθότι καὶ ῾Ρόδιοι· ἀπὸ δὲ τῆc cυνβολῆc τῶν ποταμῶν πορευθέντεc διὰ τοῦ π[εδίου]
[καὶ ἀναβάντεc ἐπὶ τοῦ ὑ]περκειμένου λόφου τὸν ὑπὸ ῾Ροδίων τεθέντα ὅρον εὕρομεν· ἀπὸ δὲ τούτου ἐπὶ τὸν ἐχόμενον βουνὸν παραμ[ορευ]-
[θέντεc τὸν ὑπὸ ῾Ροδίων τεθέντα ὅρον εὕρ]ομεν· ἀπὸ δὲ τούτου ἐπὶ τὸ ἔλαccον βουνίον τὸ πα[ρὰ] τὴν φάρανγα ἐλθόντεc τὸν μέν ὑπὸ ῾Ροδίων τεθέντ[α ὅρον]
[οὐχ εὕρομεν, αὐτοὶ δ' ἐθήκαμεν· ἀπ]ὸ δὲ τούτου διαβάντεc τὴν μείζω φάρανγα ἐπὶ τὸ μετέωρον ἐπ' εὐθείαc τὸν ὑπὸ ῾Ροδίων τεθέντα ὅρον εὕρο[μεν· ἀπὸ]
[δὲ τούτου - - - - - - - - - - - - - - ἐ]πὶ τὸν ποταμὸν τὸν καλούμενον ὑπὸ μὲν Caμίων Μαιμαλώπη, ὑπὸ δὲ Πριηνέων τὸν ἀπὸ Λαιμαcγορείαc[c - - -]

[- - - - - - - ἀπέναντι τοῦ βουνοῦ το]ῦ̣ ἀνατείνοντος ἐπάνω [τὸν] μὲν ὑπὸ
'Ροδίων ὅρον τ[ε]θ̣έντα οὐχ εὕρομεν, αὐτοὶ δὲ ἐθήκαμεν· ἀπὸ δὲ τούτου
ἐπ̣' [εὐθεί]-
[ας - - - - - - - - - - τὸν μὲν ὑπὸ 'Ρο]δίων τεθέντ[α ὅρον οὐχ ε]ὕρομεν, αὐτοὶ
δὲ ἐ[θ]ήκαμεν· ἀπ[ὸ] δὲ τούτου ἐπ' εὐθείας ἐπὶ [τὸ] π̣ετρῶδες ἑλθόν[τες
- - -]
- - - - - - ἄλλον ὅρον [ἐθήκαμεν - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]α- - - - - - - - - -
- - - -ν ἕως τοῦ ὅρο[υc or ὅρου? - - - - - - - - - - πα]ρὰ τῆι φάρα[νγι - - - - -]
[- - τὸν μ]ὲν ὑπὸ 'Ροδ̣ί[ων ἐπικολαφθέντα ὅρον οὐχ εὕρομεν, αὐτοὶ δ' ἐπεκο-
λάψαμεν ἐπὶ το]ῦ πέτρου οὗ - - - - - - -
- - ἀπ̣ὸ̣ δ̣ὲ̣ τ̣[ούτου -τὸν μὲ]ν ὑπὸ 'Ροδίων
ἐ̣[πικολαφθέντα ὅρον]
[οὐχ εὕρομεν, αὐτοὶ δ' ἐπεκολάψαμεν· - - - - - - - - - - -] αὐτοῦ τοὺc - - - - - -
[- ἐ]πὶ τὸν ἀπέν[αντι λόφον? -
- -]
[- κα]ταβάντ[ες - - - - - -]
[- ἀπένα]ντι το[ῦ - - - - - - -]
- -
[- - - ἐπ]ὶ̣ τὸν ποταμ[ὸν - - - - - -]
- - - τὴν 'Ροδίων ἀπόφ[ασιν - - - -]
[- - - 'Ε]κατόμνωι Μενάν[δρου - -]
- - - -οιc δὲ Θρασυ- - - - - - - -

1: Θεοδώρου· [ἡμεῖc] αὐτοὶ δ' ἐθήκαμεν: LeBas/Waddington. || 2: πρὸc [δὲ τὸν θεόν]: Foucart (*ap. IPriene*). || 6: διο[ίκημα?]: LeBas/Waddington, Hicks. διό[ρθωμα]: Haussoullier (*ap. IPriene*). δ{ι}ό[γμα?]: Wilamowitz (*ap. IPriene*). || 7: ἐφο[ρῶντεc?]: LeBas/Waddington. || 10: [ποταμῶν καὶ λιμνῶν καὶ ὀρῶν καὶ λόφων καὶ β]ουνῶν: LeBas/Waddington. || 11: [ἡμετέραν ὁροθεcίαν, ὑπολαβόντεc ὅπωc ἀμφοτέ]ροιc: LeBas/Waddington. ἢ καὶ: LeBas/Waddington. || 12: [ἀκα]θάρτοιc cημείοιc: LeBas/Waddington. || 13: [ἐνομ]ίcαμεν ἢ: LeBas/Waddington. || 14: [τῶν δὲ δικαcτων? πᾶcαν ἐνε]γκαμένων cπουδὴν: LeBas/Waddington. || 42: αἰγιλῶδεc: Hicks.

The evidence for this case constitutes the final entries in the series of documents inscribed on the north anta and wall of the temple of Athena Polias at Priene. A number of these documents have already been discussed in connection with other cases, as this particular section of the temple was apparently home to the Prienian copies of arbitral awards in their favour.[1] The most significant of the disputes recorded by the Athena Polias inscriptions was of course the centuries-old quarrel between Samos and Priene over the Batinetis (**26**), and over the district of Dryoussa specifically (**74**, **99**). Their disagreement was decided by arbitration several times in the Hellenistic age alone; prior to the present case, the most recent judgements had been handed down by Rhodes sometime in the

1. See **74**, **100**; cf. also **26**. The fact that the Prienians seem to have inscribed only awards in their own favour has been previously discussed.

190s and by Manlius Vulso in 188. In spite of the extreme patience and care with which the Rhodian judges had carried out their mandate, Vulso overturned it, restoring Dryoussa and the fortress of Karion to Samos. Fifty years later representatives from Priene and Samos were in Rome, arguing the case again. It was the Prienians, the losers in 188, who stood to gain by awakening Roman interest. The fact that the period around 140 saw the Romans becoming more and more involved, directly or indirectly, with settling Greek disputes, probably encouraged Priene to try its luck again. The advocates from Samos and Priene presented their case to the senate directly, as the Melitaians and Narthakians had done (**156**). The senate was clearly prepared, at least some of the time, to hear arguments and carry out an arbitration itself, rather than delegating the task to another Greek state. But it is doubtful that the Roman senate ever devoted as much time and effort to hearing a case as would a specifically convoked court of arbitration, such as the five Rhodians who heard the Samos-Priene case in the 190s. Roman criteria for judgement often employed straightforward and easily determined guidelines, which had the effect of cutting down considerably on the time spent and the amount of evidence required.

The first two documents cited above are decrees of the senate, responding to the Samian and Prienian embassies. Although the inscriptions are incomplete, they are clearly related to one another. Nevertheless, the consensus of opinion is that they are distinct decrees and were promulgated at different times. The earlier of the two (I) cannot be dated firmly, but it may predate the second by only a brief period of time, perhaps as little as a year. The second decree gives us a consul's name, Servius Fulvius Q.f. Flaccus, and therefore a year: 135 B.C.[2] The decrees both record the same decision, that the senate could not sanction Vulso's reversal of the Rhodian arbitration. It is difficult to tell what the relationship is between the two decrees. Perhaps the second one, which addresses the Samians more specifically, was a response to a Samian challenge.

The fact that the Roman senate, when it carried out an arbitration, liked to do so in a "streamlined" manner, and scarcely could have been expected to sit through a detailed exposition of all the relevant evidence itself, is particularly apparent in this case. The third document shows that a boundary delimitation *was* required and took place, probably in the 130s. Boundary markers recording the Rhodian findings had disappeared or been vandalized over time. But the Romans did not carry out a demarcation of territory themselves; this task seems to have been delegated by them to another state, perhaps Mylasa.[3] There is no irrefutable proof that the boundary commission that carried out the

2. Broughton, vol. 1, pp. 488–89.

3. The name of the state that performed the boundary delimitation for Priene and Samos is lost. Mylasa would fit and has been suggested on the strength of its participation in an arbitration between Priene and another of its neighbours, Magnesia, at about this time (**146**); see *IPriene*, p. 48; Tod 65.

work described in document III did so in accordance with Roman requests emanating from the judgements recorded in documents I and II. But there are some arguments in favour of connecting the third inscription to the Roman decrees. For one thing, its style and its location on the temple wall (immediately below II) point to a date later than the 135 decree, but not very much later.[4] There may be a reference to a *senatus consultum* in the boundary arbitration (line 6), a decree that could have laid down the regulations for the Greek judges to follow. It is possible that this *senatus consultum* is the same as the final decree of 135. A convincing reason for making this connection is that the arbitration document III, like documents I and II, depends specifically on the Rhodian arbitration of the 190s. The boundary commission that recorded its findings in our third document referred continually to the demarcation carried out by the Rhodian judges decades earlier.

It has been claimed that the Roman arbitration of 135 (and the boundary commission of perhaps a year or so later) put an end to the seemingly endless Samos-Priene dispute. As with other "repeaters," however, we have no evidence one way or the other. It is possible that the Samians finally relinquished their claims to Karion and Dryoussa; but it is equally possible that they revived them again at some later date. Early in the first century Priene sent an ambassador to Samos to discuss matters concerning a piece of land; this unidentified territory may well have been part of the Batinetis.[5]

161. Bargylia arbitrates a dispute between Rhodes and Stratonikeia (c. 130)

Three fragments of an inscription (A, B, and C) discovered in the ruins of Bargylia, and now lost. Only the relevant portion (C) is cited here.

P. Foucart, *Mémoires de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres* 37 (1904) pp. 326–35; M. Holleaux, *REA* 21 (1919) pp. 1–19 (= *Études*, vol. 2, pp. 194f.); *W. Blümel, *Die Inschriften von Iasos* II (Bonn, 1985) 612.

Dittenberger, *OGIS* II *add.* p. 551; Magie, *Buckler Studies*, p. 18; id., *RRAM*, vol. 1, p. 114; vol. 2, p. 965; L. Robert, *Études anatoliennes* (Amsterdam, 1970) pp. 463–65; Gruen, p. 108; Sherk, *TDGR* 43; Ager, *Historia* 40 (1991) p. 40.

C γενέσθαι ὑπέμεινεν καὶ ἀπο[δημήσας εἰς Ῥόδον μετὰ τῶν αὐτῶι συναπο]-

4. See Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene*, p. 48, who argues that the boundary judgement could scarcely have been made before 130. But there is in fact no reason why it could not have taken place as soon as the Roman decrees became public, later in 135 or into 134.

5. See **171**, document III, lines 25–26.

work described in document III did so in accordance with Roman requests emanating from the judgements recorded in documents I and II. But there are some arguments in favour of connecting the third inscription to the Roman decrees. For one thing, its style and its location on the temple wall (immediately below II) point to a date later than the 135 decree, but not very much later.[4] There may be a reference to a *senatus consultum* in the boundary arbitration (line 6), a decree that could have laid down the regulations for the Greek judges to follow. It is possible that this *senatus consultum* is the same as the final decree of 135. A convincing reason for making this connection is that the arbitration document III, like documents I and II, depends specifically on the Rhodian arbitration of the 190s. The boundary commission that recorded its findings in our third document referred continually to the demarcation carried out by the Rhodian judges decades earlier.

It has been claimed that the Roman arbitration of 135 (and the boundary commission of perhaps a year or so later) put an end to the seemingly endless Samos-Priene dispute. As with other "repeaters," however, we have no evidence one way or the other. It is possible that the Samians finally relinquished their claims to Karion and Dryoussa; but it is equally possible that they revived them again at some later date. Early in the first century Priene sent an ambassador to Samos to discuss matters concerning a piece of land; this unidentified territory may well have been part of the Batinetis.[5]

161. Bargylia arbitrates a dispute between Rhodes and Stratonikeia (c. 130)

Three fragments of an inscription (A, B, and C) discovered in the ruins of Bargylia, and now lost. Only the relevant portion (C) is cited here.

P. Foucart, *Mémoires de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres* 37 (1904) pp. 326–35; M. Holleaux, *REA* 21 (1919) pp. 1–19 (= *Études*, vol. 2, pp. 194f.); *W. Blümel, *Die Inschriften von Iasos* II (Bonn, 1985) 612.

Dittenberger, *OGIS* II *add.* p. 551; Magie, *Buckler Studies*, p. 18; id., *RRAM*, vol. 1, p. 114; vol. 2, p. 965; L. Robert, *Études anatoliennes* (Amsterdam, 1970) pp. 463–65; Gruen, p. 108; Sherk, *TDGR* 43; Ager, *Historia* 40 (1991) p. 40.

C γενέσθαι ὑπέμεινεν καὶ ἀπο[δημήσας εἰς Ῥόδον μετὰ τῶν αὐτῶι συναπο]-

4. See Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene*, p. 48, who argues that the boundary judgement could scarcely have been made before 130. But there is in fact no reason why it could not have taken place as soon as the Roman decrees became public, later in 135 or into 134.

5. See **171**, document III, lines 25–26.

[c]ταλέντων ἀνδρῶν καὶ ἐπελθὼ[ν ἐπὶ τὴν βουλὴν καὶ τὸν δῆμον παρεστήσατο]
45 Ῥοδίους καταθέσθαι μὲν τὴν ὑπάρχο[υσαν αὐτοῖς πρὸς τὴν πόλιν Στρατονι]-
[κ]ήων ἀπέχθειαν, ἐπιεικῆ δὲ καὶ φιλάνθρωπ[ο]ν ὑ[πὲρ τῶν ἀμφιλεγομένων
ποήσας]-
θαι διοίκησιν· χειροτονηθέντος δὲ τοῦ ψηφίσμ[ατος ὑπὸ τοῦ Ῥοδίων δήμου
καθ' δ]
ἡμέλλ[ο]σαν ἐξαποστελεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν σύνκλη[τον τὴν Ῥωμαίων πρεσβείαν,]
ἔδοξεν αὐτοῖς μηκέτι πέμπειν, ἐπακολουθ[ῆσαι δὲ τοῖς ὑπὸ τῆς πόλεως Βαρ]-
50 [γυ]λιητῶν παρακαλουμένοις καὶ ἐπιτρέ[ψ]αι τῶι [ἡμετέρωι δήμωι τὴν τῶν
ἀμφιλε]-
γομένων διεξαγωγήν, τῆσδε πίστεως δοθε[ίσης τοῖς παραγενομένοις παρ' ἡ]-
[μ]ῶν πρεσβευταῖς· ἀφικόμενοι δὲ καὶ εἰς [Στ]ρατονίκειαν [ἐπελθόντες τε ἐπὶ
τὴν βου]-
λὴν καὶ τὸν δῆμον καὶ τοὺς ἁρμόζοντας ποησά[μενοι πρὸς αὐτοὺς λόγους
παρεστήσαν]-
το καὶ τούτους πρὸς τὰς συλλύσεις, καὶ χειροτο[νηθέντος τοῦ ψηφίσματος
τοῦ περὶ τῆς]
55 πρεσβεία[ς] ἔδοξεν καὶ τούτοις μηκέτι πέμπειν, ἐ[π]ι[τρέψαι δὲ τὰ ἀμφιλεγό-
μενα]
πράγματα τῆι Βαργυλιη[τ]ῶν πόλει καὶ τῆς πίστεως δο[θείσης τῆς ὑπὲρ τούτων]
τοῖς περὶ Ποσειδώ[νιον]· ὁ δὲ προθύμω[ς ὑπακούσας ἐπανῆλθεν εἰς τὴν πόλιν
με]-
[τ]ὰ τῶν πρεσβευτῶν [καὶ γρά]ψας πάλιν ψήφ[ισμα - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
αὐτοὺς πρεσβευ[τὰς - - - - - - - -]ειν βουλομε- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
60 μησαντες εις- - - - - - - - - - - - - -της- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
- -

55: πρεσβείαν: Foucart. || 59–60: Blümel suggests perhaps [ἐπιδη]|μήσαντες εἰς.

The fragments of this Bargylian inscription honour a citizen of that community, one Poseidonios, for various services. Internal evidence suggests that the inscription and the events it refers to should be dated to the period of Rome's war with Aristonikos, in the wake of the death of Attalos III of Pergamon. The significance of Poseidonios's activity in the present context is revealed in the third fragment. There we discover that the states of Rhodes and Stratonikeia had a dispute with one another. The two disputants were preparing to turn to Rome when Poseidonios headed an embassy to Rhodes, an embassy that persuaded them to submit their differences to Bargylia instead. Apparently the initiative here came from the outside state, Bargylia. Outside initiative was not unprecedented; Pergamon sent an embassy to Mytilene and Pitane to urge arbitration and then agreed to act as the arbitrator.[1]

1. See **146**; Robert, *Études anatoliennes*, p. 463.

In the early decades of the second century Rhodes had controlled most of the adjacent mainland, including both Bargylia and Stratonikeia. In those years the Rhodians had been the preeminent arbitrators and mediators of the region, carrying out international negotiations for independent states like Miletos and Magnesia (**109**) as well as sending deputations of foreign judges to places like Stratonikeia.[2] But in the later second century, Rhodes apparently was ready to turn to others to settle disputes, perhaps territorial in nature, that it had itself with one of its old dependents, Stratonikeia. Bargylia's intercession kept the Stratonikeia-Rhodes dispute a Carian affair. Poseidonios of Bargylia had witnessed an impressive Roman presence in the region during the war of Aristonikos; perhaps this was an effort to assert some degree of regional independence.

162. Disputes between Kolophon and its neighbours settled by Rome (c. 130–120)

An inscription in several columns from Claros. Only the relevant portions are cited here. See Robert for epigraphic details.

*J. Robert and L. Robert, *Claros* I: *Décrets hellénistiques* (Paris, 1989) pp. 63–104.

I: *Column I, lines* 17–23 *and* 31–37

... μεγίστας
δὲ καὶ περὶ ἀναγκαιοτάτων πρεσβείας τετέλεκε
πρὸς αὐτὴν τὴν τῶν ἡγουμένων σύνκλητον,
δὶς μὲν ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς τῆς πόλεως εἰς Ῥώμην πορευ-
θεὶς καὶ τηρήσας ἄθραυστα τὰ τοῦ δήμου φιλάνθρω-
πα, τρίτον περὶ τῆς Διοσιερίτιδος χώρας καὶ τῶν κα-
τὰ τὰ Στενὰ καὶ τὸ Πρεπέλαιον τόπων, κτλ....

... ἐμ
πάσαις δὲ μετὰ τῶν συμπρεσβευτῶν κατωρθω-
κὼς καὶ κάλλιστα καὶ συμφορώτατα δόγματα παρὰ
τῶν κρατούντων ἐνηνοχώς, τῆς μὲν παραλίου
χώρας τὴν πανκτησίαν βεβαιότεραν πεποίηκε τῶι
δήμωι, τῆς δὲ κατὰ τὰ Στενὰ καὶ τὸ Πρεπέλαιον
τοὺς πατρίους ὅρους τετήρηκεν, κτλ....

II: Column I, lines 50–54/Column II, lines 1–7

... Μητροπολι-
τῶν δὲ καταιτιασαμένων ὡς ἐκ τῆς ἐκείνων ἀνδρο-

2. M. Cetin Sahin, *Die Inschriften von Stratonikeia* I (Bonn, 1981) 9.

In the early decades of the second century Rhodes had controlled most of the adjacent mainland, including both Bargylia and Stratonikeia. In those years the Rhodians had been the preeminent arbitrators and mediators of the region, carrying out international negotiations for independent states like Miletos and Magnesia (**109**) as well as sending deputations of foreign judges to places like Stratonikeia.[2] But in the later second century, Rhodes apparently was ready to turn to others to settle disputes, perhaps territorial in nature, that it had itself with one of its old dependents, Stratonikeia. Bargylia's intercession kept the Stratonikeia-Rhodes dispute a Carian affair. Poseidonios of Bargylia had witnessed an impressive Roman presence in the region during the war of Aristonikos; perhaps this was an effort to assert some degree of regional independence.

162. Disputes between Kolophon and its neighbours settled by Rome (c. 130–120)

An inscription in several columns from Claros. Only the relevant portions are cited here. See Robert for epigraphic details.

*J. Robert and L. Robert, *Claros* I: *Décrets hellénistiques* (Paris, 1989) pp. 63–104.

I: *Column I, lines* 17–23 *and* 31–37

... μεγίστας
δὲ καὶ περὶ ἀναγκαιοτάτων πρεσβείας τετέλεκε
πρὸς αὐτὴν τὴν τῶν ἡγουμένων σύνκλητον,
δὶς μὲν ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς τῆς πόλεως εἰς Ῥώμην πορευ-
θεὶς καὶ τηρήσας ἄθραυστα τὰ τοῦ δήμου φιλάνθρω-
πα, τρίτον περὶ τῆς Διοσιερίτιδος χώρας καὶ τῶν κα-
τὰ τὰ Στενὰ καὶ τὸ Πρεπέλαιον τόπων, κτλ....

... ἐμ
πάσαις δὲ μετὰ τῶν συμπρεσβευτῶν κατωρθω-
κὼς καὶ κάλλιστα καὶ συμφορώτατα δόγματα παρὰ
τῶν κρατούντων ἐνηνοχώς, τῆς μὲν παραλίου
χώρας τὴν πανκτησίαν βεβαιότεραν πεποίηκε τῶι
δήμωι, τῆς δὲ κατὰ τὰ Στενὰ καὶ τὸ Πρεπέλαιον
τοὺς πατρίους ὅρους τετήρηκεν, κτλ....

II: Column I, lines 50–54/Column II, lines 1–7

... Μητροπολι-
τῶν δὲ καταιτιασαμένων ὡς ἐκ τῆς ἐκείνων ἀνδρο-

2. M. Cetin Sahin, *Die Inschriften von Stratonikeia* I (Bonn, 1981) 9.

λήψιον πεποιημένων τῶν ἡμετέρων ἀρχόντων
καὶ ψευδεῖς ἀναχρίσεις ἀναγραφόντων κατὰ τῶν
πρωτεύειν τότε δοκούντων παρ' αὐτοῖς ἐν τῆι
- -
- -

τον ἐτήρησε Τ . . . . . ΙΝΟΥΔΑΤΕΛΕΣ . . . . . .
σε τὴν τῶν ἀντιπρεσβευόντων ἐπιβουλήν, ἀλ-
λὰ καὶ προσγεγραμμένον ἦνεγκε τῆι ἀποκρίσει
διότι τῆς ἐπαρχείας ἐκτὸς οὔτε κρίνειν οὔτε
5 πολυπραγμονεῖν τῶι στρατηγῶι καθήκει, ἰδι-
ώτατον τῆι δημοκρατίαι καὶ κάλλιστον ἐνέγκας ἀ-
πόκριμα, κτλ . . .

This lengthy inscription is a decree honoring Menippos of Kolophon for various benefactions he performed for his state. The decree, like several others from the same period, recounts the many years of this individual's services, offering a portrait of his entire political career.[1] Menippos pursued his career during the final years of the kingdom of Pergamon, the period of the war with Aristonikos, and the establishment of the province of Asia.[2] As one of his state's more eminent citizens, he was involved, as its representative, in the settlement of certain disputes. Menippos's contributions were evidently of particular value in the context of Roman involvement in these affairs.

The first passage cited above comes from a summary of Menippos's ambassadorial activity. Menippos had undertaken a series of embassies to Rome, including one whose purpose was to have the senate confirm the free status of Kolophon. The third embassy concerned certain territories that Kolophon claimed (I, lines 22–23). The territory of Dioshieron was evidently the coastal territory mentioned later in the inscription (I, lines 34–35), while "the Narrows" and the Prepelaion fell within boundaries that Kolophon argued were ancestral (I, lines 36–37). Menippos was successful in having the senate affirm Kolophonian possession of these places. Although the inscription does not speak of a specific opponent who had laid a rival claim to these regions, the fact that Menippos was sent on an embassy to the senate over this matter leads to the conclusion that Kolophon had a boundary dispute with one of its neighbours, a dispute settled by Rome. The implication of the phrase κάλλιστα καὶ συμφορώτατα δόγματα παρὰ τῶν κρατούντων seems to be that this is one of those relatively

1. Cf. the decrees honouring Orthagoras (**130**), Poseidonios (**161**), and Krates (**171**), as well as the other honorary decree (for Polemaios) published in *Claros* I.

2. Robert (p. 99) suggests that a reasonable context for Kolophon's judicial disputes and embassies to Rome, concerned as they were with the affirmation of Kolophon's status and boundaries, is the period of Manius Aquillius's governorship and the establishment of the province of Asia (129–126).

rare cases where the Roman senate itself passed judgement on the disputed territory.[3]

The other passage does not in fact constitute a full-fledged case of arbitration. It speaks of a different kind of dispute, not over territory but over the (allegedly illegal) seizure of certain persons (ἀνδρολήψιον, I, lines 51–52). Kolophon's neighbour, the little city of Metropolis, claimed that the Kolophonian magistrates had seized certain persons on Metropolitan territory, and furthermore that they had laid some kind of false accusations. Unfortunately there is a break in the inscription at this point; but the resumption of the story at the beginning of column II implies that the Metropolitans had laid their charges before the Roman governor, and that Menippos appeared to defend Kolophon's interests. Those interests were best served not by addressing the specifics of the dispute with Metropolis but rather by obtaining the recognition that Kolophon as a free city did not fall within the jurisdiction of the Roman governor. Menippos was evidently so convincing that the resulting interpretation of Kolophon's autonomous status also ruled out any question of the Roman governor acting as a neutral arbitrator. Perhaps the nature of the conflict was influential here. It was not a matter of a third-party decision over contested public territory but rather of charges laid against the governing magistrates of a free city; Roman interference, no matter how neutral, was bound to be perceived as invasive.

163. Rome and the Amphiktyony settle affairs at Delphi (125?)

A lengthy inscription in several columns from the temple of Apollo at Delphi recording a series of documents dealing with hieromnemonic judgements concerning the temple treasury and the sacred land, perhaps in 125 B.C. Below it is inscribed the bilingual inscription from A.D. 116/7 cited in **88** (*SIG*^{3} 827). See Plassart, *FDelphes* III.4, 3, pp. 5f., for epigraphic details. Only the relevant documents are cited here.

I: The oath of the Amphiktyonic representatives (column B, lines 10–16). Colin, *BCH* 27 (1903) p. 107; Dittenberger/ Pomtow, *SIG*^{3} 826C; *Plassart, *FDelphes* III.4, 3.278.

II: Amphiktyonic judgement on the boundaries of the sacred land vis-à-vis the inhabitants of Antikyra, Amphissa, and Ambryssos; partially cited in **1**, and cf. also **22** and **88** (column B, lines 28–33; column C, lines 1–38; column D, lines 1–6). De Ruggiero 1B; Colin, *BCH* 27 (1903) pp. 107–9; Mommsen, *CIL* III.2,

3. Cf. **156**, **160**.

rare cases where the Roman senate itself passed judgement on the disputed territory.[3]

The other passage does not in fact constitute a full-fledged case of arbitration. It speaks of a different kind of dispute, not over territory but over the (allegedly illegal) seizure of certain persons (ἀνδρολήψιον, I, lines 51–52). Kolophon's neighbour, the little city of Metropolis, claimed that the Kolophonian magistrates had seized certain persons on Metropolitan territory, and furthermore that they had laid some kind of false accusations. Unfortunately there is a break in the inscription at this point; but the resumption of the story at the beginning of column II implies that the Metropolitans had laid their charges before the Roman governor, and that Menippos appeared to defend Kolophon's interests. Those interests were best served not by addressing the specifics of the dispute with Metropolis but rather by obtaining the recognition that Kolophon as a free city did not fall within the jurisdiction of the Roman governor. Menippos was evidently so convincing that the resulting interpretation of Kolophon's autonomous status also ruled out any question of the Roman governor acting as a neutral arbitrator. Perhaps the nature of the conflict was influential here. It was not a matter of a third-party decision over contested public territory but rather of charges laid against the governing magistrates of a free city; Roman interference, no matter how neutral, was bound to be perceived as invasive.

163. Rome and the Amphiktyony settle affairs at Delphi (125?)

A lengthy inscription in several columns from the temple of Apollo at Delphi recording a series of documents dealing with hieromnemonic judgements concerning the temple treasury and the sacred land, perhaps in 125 B.C. Below it is inscribed the bilingual inscription from A.D. 116/7 cited in **88** (*SIG*^{3} 827). See Plassart, *FDelphes* III.4, 3, pp. 5f., for epigraphic details. Only the relevant documents are cited here.

I: The oath of the Amphiktyonic representatives (column B, lines 10–16). Colin, *BCH* 27 (1903) p. 107; Dittenberger/ Pomtow, *SIG*^{3} 826C; *Plassart, *FDelphes* III.4, 3.278.

II: Amphiktyonic judgement on the boundaries of the sacred land vis-à-vis the inhabitants of Antikyra, Amphissa, and Ambryssos; partially cited in **1**, and cf. also **22** and **88** (column B, lines 28–33; column C, lines 1–38; column D, lines 1–6). De Ruggiero 1B; Colin, *BCH* 27 (1903) pp. 107–9; Mommsen, *CIL* III.2,

3. Cf. **156**, **160**.

p. 987, no. XVI (*add.* to no. 567), lines 1–44; Dittenberger/Pomtow, *SIG*^{3} 826E; *Plassart, *FDelphes* III.4, 3.280.

G. Colin, BCH 27 (1903) pp. 104–73; Tod 26; H. Pomtow, *Klio* 16 (1919) p. 139; Steinwenter, pp. 184, 186; P. Roussel, *BCH* 56 (1932) pp. 1–36; Daux, *Delphes,* pp. 372–86, 699–707; Lerat, pp. 101–2; Daverio Rocchi, pp. 132–42; id., *Mélanges.*

I: The oath of the Amphiktyones

B Ὅρκος Ἀμφικτι[όνων.
πᾶν π]ρᾶγμα ἐν τῶ[ι κρίμ]ατ[ι περὶ χρημάτων καὶ ὅρων Ἀπόλλωνος δικάζω καθ']
ὃ ἂν ἐγὼ μάλιστα δό[ξω ἀληθ]ὲ̣ς̣ εἶναι, οὔτε χάριτος οὕτε φιλίας [οὕτε ἔχθ]ρας εἵνεκεν ψεύδε[α] κρινῶ [κατ' οὐδένα τρόπον· καὶ τὰ καταδικασθέντα ἀκολούθως]
τῶι κρίματι κατὰ τὰ̣[ν δύνα]μιν μάλιστα ἐκπράξω ὃ ἂν τάχιστα δύ[νωμαι], ἀποκαταστήσω τε τῶι θεῶι [δικαίως. οὐδὲ δῶρα δέξομαι οὔτε αὐτὸς ἐγώ, οὔτε]
ἄλλος ἐμοί, οὔτε [τῶν κοιν]ῶν χρημάτων οὐθενὶ μὴ δῶ, οὔτε ἐγὼ [μεταλή]ψομαι· ταῦτα ἐγὼ οὕτως ποι[ή]σ[ω. καὶ εὐορκοῦντι μέν μοι εἴη πολλὰ καὶ ἀγαθά·]
ἐφιορκοῦντι δὲ Θ̣[έμις] καὶ Ἀπόλλων Πύθιος καὶ Λατὼ καὶ Ἄρτεμ[ις καὶ] Ἑστία καὶ πῦρ ἀθάνατον καὶ θεοὶ π̣ά[ντες καὶ πᾶσαι κακίστωι ὀλέθρωι τὴν]
15 σωτηρίαν μοι [ἀφέλωσι]γ̣, μήτε τέκνων μήτε σπορῶν μήτε καρπῷ̣[ν μή]τε οὐσίας κατόνασθαι ἐάσως(ιν) ἐμέ [τε αὐτὸν καὶ τὸ γένος ἐμόν, καί με]
ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχ̣[όντ]ω̣ν ἰδίων ζῶντα ἐγβάλωσι εἰ ἐφιορκήσω.

15: the stone reads ἐάσωσε ἐμέ.

II: The demarcation of the sacred land

B Ἀμφικτίονες ἐπέγνωσαν
περὶ ὅρων Ἀπόλλωνος, ποίοις ὅροις
ὁρίσασθαι δεῖ. ^{vvv} Ἀμφισσεῖς Ἀριστοκλέας, Δάμων πρεσβευτ[αὶ ἐλ]έγοσαν ὅτι δεῖ τὸ κρίμα ἑστηκὸς καὶ κύριον εἶναι τὸ τότε γεγονός, ὅτε Παυσανίας
30 Θεσσαλὸς καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ ὅρους ἐποίησαν. ^{v} Ἀντικυρεῖς, Ἀμ[βρ]υ̣σσιοι, Δελφοὶ ἐλέγοσαν τούτωι τῶι κρίματι ἑστηκὸς καὶ κύριον εἶναι δεῖν, ὅτε [ὅ]ρον ἱερομνήμονες πεποί[η]καν καὶ [κ]ε[κ]ρίκασιν ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Ὀ[ρνι]χ̣ίδα ἐν Δελφοῖς· ^{vvv} ὑπὲρ τούτων τοὺς λόγους ἐποήσατο Νικάτας Ἀλκίνου
[Δ]ελφός. ^{v} ἔκριναν· ^{v} Δελφῶν ψᾶφοι δύο· ἱερομνημόνων κρί[ματι στ]ῆναι. ^{v} Θεσσαλῶν ψῆφοι δύο· ἱερομνημόνων κρίματι στῆναι. ^{vvv} Ἀχαιῶν
[Φθι]ωτῶν ψῆφοι δύο· ἱερομνημόνων [κρ]ίματι στῆναι. ^{v} Βοιωτ[ῶν ψῆφοι] δύο· ἱερομνημόνων κρίματι στῆναι. ^{v} Φωκέων ψῆφοι δύο· ἱερομνημόνων
C [κρίματι στῆναι. Μαγνήτων ψῆφοι δύο· ἱερομνημόνων κρίματι στῆναι. Αἰν]ι̣άνων ψῆφ[οι δ]ύο· ἱερομνημόνων
[κρίματι στῆναι. Μαλιέων ψῆφος· ἱερομνημόνων κρίματι στῆν]αι. ^{v} Οἰτα[ίων] ψῆφος· ἱερο[μ]νημόνων κρίματι στῆναι.

[Ἀθηναίων ψῆφος· ἱερομνημόνων κρίματι στῆναι. Εὐβοιέων ψ]ῆφος· ἱερομνημόνων κρίματι στῆναι. ⁝ Λ[ο]κρῶν
[Ἑσπερίων ψῆφος· ἱερομνημόνων κρίματι στῆναι. Λοκρῶν Ὑπ]οκνημιδίων ψῆφος· ἱερομνημόνων κρί[μ]ατι
[στῆναι. Δωριέων τῶν ἐγ μητροπόλεως ψῆφος· ἱερομνημόνων κρίμ]ατι στῆναι. ⁝ Δωριέων τῶν ἐκ Πελοποννή-
[σου ψῆφος· ἱερομνημόνων κρίματι στῆναι. Δολόπων ψῆφος· ἱερομνη]μόνων κρίματι στῆναι. ⁝ Περραιβῶν ψῆφος· ἱε-
[ρομνημόνων κρίματι στῆναι. ἔκριναν περὶ τῶν ὅρων τῆς χώ]ρας ἱερᾶς, ὥστε κρίμα κύριον εἶναι δ [ο]ἱ ἱερομνή-
[μονες ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Ὀρνιχίδα ἐν Δελφοῖς πεποιήκασιν οἱ ὁρίζοντες τὴν] ὁμοροῦσαν τῇι ἱερᾶι χώραι κατὰ πρόσωπον. ὅροι
[περιεγράφησαν . . . 10 . . ., διὰ ταύτην τὴν αἰτίαν ὅτι ἰδιῶταί τινες κατ]έχουσι τοὺς ἐξ συγκλήτου δόγματος
[τῶι θεῶι δεδομένους ἀγρούς, ἔστι δ' ὅπου ἐπεργάζονται . . . 14 . . . κα]ί τινες δῆμ[οι ὁμ]οροῦσαν ἑκάστου. ἄρχοντες καὶ
[πρεσβευταὶ . . . c. 50 . . . ἦρ]νται· ⁝ Ἀντ[ικυ]ρεῖς· Φίλων Εὐξένου,
Ἐμπεδοκλῆς
. . . c. 61 . . . ονίκου, Cω[cιγ]ένης Ἀπολλοδώρου, Κάλλων Πολυ-
. . . c. 63 . . . Κάλλων C[ωκρ]άτους ⁝ ἄρχοντες ⁝ Ἀρίστων Ξενο-
[κρίτου, . . . c. 52 . . . Πρ]αξίας Ἀλκιδ̣ά̣[μ]ου, Εὔδαμος Εὐκρίτου [⁝] πρεσβευ-
[ταὶ . . . c. 58 . . .] Ἀμύντας Εὐδώρου, Ἀγίων Πολυκλείτου, Ἀμ-
[φικcεῖc· . . . c. 63 . . .]ας Δάμων[ος . . . . .]ικος . . . τί[ων]ος, Μοcχίων
. . . c. 60 . . . ε . . . . . ., [Cώξ]ενος Κλέωνος ⁝⁝⁝ ἄρχο[ντε]c Χαιρέ-
[δαμος . . . 19 . . .]c Φι[λλέ]α, ⁝ Ἀρι . . . 15 . . ., Ἀμύντας Ἀριστοδάμου, ⁝ Πολύκριτος Καλ[λιξ]ένου,
. . . 23 . . . κύθου, . νάρης . . . 12 . . . [Δ]άμων Ἀριστοδάμου ⁝ ἄρχοντες ⁝ Ἀριcτόδαμος Δάμω-
[νος, . . . 19 . . .] Θεοφάνου, ⁝ Εὐμηλίδα[c Πρωτάρχου, Πρώ]ταρχος Εὐμηλίδα, ⁝ Κλέανδρος Αἰτωλίωνος. [⁝] ἀπὸ θαλάc-
[cης ἡ πρὸc Ἀντί]κυράν ἐcτ[ι, ὅριο]ν Ὀπ̣[όεντα πρῶτον. ἐξ Ὀποέ]ντας εἰc ἄκρα Κολώφεια[vac. 12] εἰc ὀρθόν. ἐξ ἄκρων
[Κολωφείων εἰc ὀ]ρθὸν εἰc Δ[ολιχῶντα καλουμένην πέτραν. ἐκ] Δολιχῶντος εἰc ἥρωα τὸ Εὐόριον καλούμενον, οὗ cτήλη
[ἐcτὶν ἐπιγεγραμ]μένη ὅρι[ον. ἐκ τοῦ Εὐορίου ἥρωος εἰc] ἄκρα Μελίου. ⁝ ἐξ ἄκρων Μελίο[υ εἰc τὸ]ν̣ χάροδρον οὗ ὄνο-
[μά ἐcτι . . . . .]c̣ηρ τ . . . 15 . . . [π]αρὰ [τὴν ῥί]ζαν Κίρφου ὡc ὕδωρ ῥέει τρ[ι]ά̣[κοντα cτάδια ἐ]μ μ[éc]ω[ι] τ̣οῦ̣
[. . . 10 . . . χαρόδρου, καὶ ἐκεῖθ]ε[ν ἐν τ]ῆι αὐτῆι χαράδραι εἰc τὸν Προ . . . ον π̣ο[ταμὸν] . . . . . βουν̣[ν]οῦ ἐ[πὶ] τῆι
[ἱερᾶι χώραι τῶν] Δελφῶν πρὸc̣ πέτραν πρώτην ἣ καλεῖται Ὑπ̣[οφαοῦν . . . 24 . . . οὗ ἐcτιν] ἡρ[ῶιον.] ἐκ
[πέτρας καλουμένης] Ὑποφαοῦντος εἰc πέτραν ἣ Ἰcτεφῶν καλεῖται. ἐξ [Ἰcτε]φ[ῶντος πέτρας εἰc ὅρον] ἐν οἰκοδο-

[μήμασιν· ἐντὸς] τούτων ὁρίων ἐν ἱερᾶι χώραι δ κατέχει Βαβ[ύ]λος Λαιάδου
[ἐκ]χω[ρείτω. ἐκ τῶν οἰκοδομη]μάτων
[εἰς πέτραν] ἣ ὑπὸ Σκιδάρεόν ἐστι· δ ἐντὸς τούτων ὁρίων ἐστὶ, Κλεόδαμο[ς]
Φιλ[αιτώλου ἐκχωρείτω. ἐκ Σκι]δα-
[ρέου εἰς π]έτραν τὴν ἐπάνω τᾶς ὁδοῦ, οὗ τρίπους ἐνκεκόλαπται· δ ἐντὸς
το[ύτων ὁρίων κατέχει . . 16 . .]
[ἀπ]ὸ [τούτ]ου ἐκχωρησάτω καὶ τὴν οἰκίαν καθελέτω. ἐκ πέτρας τῆς ἐ[π]άν[ω
τᾶς ὁδοῦ εἰς ὀρθὸν εἰς πολυ]-
ανδρ[εῖ]ον Λακώνων ὑπὸ τὸν ὁπλίταν. ἐκ πολυανδρείου ἐπ' [ὀ]ρθὸν εἰς πέτρ[αν
. . . 23 . . . οὗ]
τρίπου[ς] ἐνκεκόλαπται· δ ἐντὸς τούτων ὁρίων κατέχε[ι Μεγάρτ]ας Μ[ελισ-
σίωνος ἐκχωρείτω. ἐκ πέτρας . . 8 . .]
εἰς τὸ Λητῶιον δ ὑπὸ Κατωπουρέου ἐστί· δ ἐντὸς τούτω[ν ὁρίων κ]ατέχ[ει
. . . 29 . . .]
ἐκχωρ[εί]τω. ἐκ τοῦ Λ[ητ]ωίου ἐπ' ὀρθὸν εἰς πέτραν ἣ 'Ιπ[. . . . . .
κ]αλε[ῖται]· δ [ἐντὸς τούτων ὁρίων κατέχει Καλ]-
λικράτης [καὶ Ἀ]ντ[ιγέ]νης Διοδώρου ἐκχωρείτω καὶ τὴ[ν οἰκία]ν καθελέτω.
[ἐξ 'Ιπ . . . . . πέτρας] ε[ἰς] ὅρο[ν]
. . τέου. ἐκ . . τέο[υ ε]ἰς ὀ[ρ]θὸν εἰς ὅρος Κοῖον δ κέκλιται πρ[ὸς Παρ]ναccόν·
ἐντὸς το[ύτων ὁρίω]ν χώρα [ἐστὶν ἣ]
καλεῖται Νάτεια γεωργουμένη, ἣν Μάνιος Ἀκίλιος τῶι θεῶι δέδωκε· ἐκ
ταύτης τῆς χώρας ἀπολλ[ύcθω] ὅc[α ἐκ]-
φέρεται. ἐγ Νατείας παρὰ τὴν χώραν γεωργουμένη[ν] γωνία ἥ ἐστιν χώρας
γεωργουμένης πρὸς τὴν ὁδὸ[ν] ᾗ ἐγ Δ[ελφῶν]
εἰς Ἄμφισσαν ἄγει. ἐκ τῆς γωνίας εἰς τὴν πέτραν ἣ ὑπὲρ 'Επανικάν ἐστιν,
ἣν Ἀμφισσεῖς ἐδεικνύοσαν· [δ ἐντὸς το]ύτων ὁρίω[ν]
κατέχει, δ ἠγορακέναι λέγει, Ἁγίων ἐκχωρείτω. ἐκ πέτρας εἰς ὀρθὸν εἰς
πέτραν οὗ τρίπους χαλκοῦς ἐστιν· δ ἐντὸ[ς] τούτων ὁ-
ρίων κατέχει Γλαῦκος καὶ 'Ηράκων ἐκχωρείτω. ἐκ τρίποδος εἰς ὀρθὸν παρὰ
c[τίχ]ον ἐλαιῶν παλαιῶν εἰς ὅρος ἄκρ[ο]ν Ταρμίηι-
ον. ἐκ Ταρμιήου εἰς ὀρθὸν εἰ[c πέ]τραν πρώτην τὸ ἐν Τριναπέᾳ ἐστίν. ἐκ
Τριν[α]πέας χάραδρος ὅc ἐστιν εἰς κρά[να]ν 'Ενβά-
τεαν. ἐκ κρήνης εἰς ὀρθὸν εἰς Ἀστράβαντα. ἐξ Ἀστράβαντος ὄ[ρος περι]άγει
εἰς [τὸν τόπο]ν ἁ[λ]είας πρὸς τὴν θάλας[c]αν. vvv

C 8–9: [οἱ ὁρίζοντες τὴν] ὁμοροῦcαν τῆι ἱερᾶι χώραι κατὰ πρόcωπον ὅροι | περιεγράφηcαν κτλ.: Colin. || C 9: [οἱ αὐτοὶ περιεγράφηcαν τῇδε διὰ ταύτην τὴν αἰτίαν κτλ.]: Dittenberger/Pomtow, *SIG*^{3}. || C 10: ἐπεργάζονται τὴν ἱερὰν χώραν: Dittenberger/Pomtow, *SIG*^{3}; τινες δῆμ[οι ὁμ]οροῦcαν· ἑκάcτου ἄρχοντες κτλ.: Colin. || C 13: Pomtow (*SIG*^{3}) restores [Ἀμβρύccιοι] in the first part of the line. || C 15: [Δελφοί]: Dittenberger/Pomtow, *SIG*^{3}. || C 16: [Μυανεῖc]: Dittenberger/Pomtow, *SIG*^{3}. || C 19: [Ἀμφιccεῖc]: Dittenberger/Pomtow, *SIG*^{3}. || C 36: ε[ἰc] ὅρο[c]: Dittenberger/Pomtow, *SIG*^{3}.

In the latter half of the second century B.C., perhaps in the year 125, the Delphic Amphiktyony was called on to convene an extraordinary session and

make a series of special judgements.[1] Daux has referred to the complex of events as "the scandal of 125"; it seems that some serious embezzlement of sacred funds had taken place, and the evidence suggests problems within Delphi itself, pitting citizens against one another. Thirteen individuals, exiled from Delphi by their enemies, turned to Rome to support them and their defense of the rights of Apollo. The senate no doubt requested the proconsul of Macedon to intervene; he in turn requested the Amphiktyony to deal with the problems, in accordance with the *senatus consultum*.[2]

The work of the Amphiktyony was not restricted to determining the amount of the deficit or inflicting fines upon certain Delphian citizens.[3] The hieromnemones were also responsible for arbitrating yet another boundary settlement between Delphi and its neighbours. The matter of central concern was the determination of the sacred land of Apollo. Parcels of land seem to have been expropriated by *Delphians* this time; and of those individuals named as guilty of this transgression, at least two, and maybe four, were sentenced to pay a fine to the god in another inscription from this series.[4] But as in 190, when the boundary delimitation involved ejecting a number of individual landowners, this settlement of the sacred land also entailed a degree of arbitration between Delphi and neighbouring states. In 125 both Delphi and its opponent Amphissa were able to look back to previous judgements that had been made about the contested region. The Amphissan representatives, Damon and Aristokleas, argued that the hieromnemones should reinstate the award of the commission of Pausanias the Thessalian, discussed in **22**. The Delphian advocate Nikatas, on the other hand (who represented also Ambryssos and Antikyra), urged that the final decision support an earlier hieromnemonic judgement, made during the archonship of Ornichidas (**1**). The Amphiktyonic representatives in 125 were persuaded by the Delphian point of view, at least with respect to the boundary arbitration. Lokrian Amphissa lost its case, probably by the unanimous vote of the hieromnemones, if it is true that even the west Lokrian vote went against it.[5] But the people who actually had to remove themselves from the sacred land, in contrast to the situation in 190 B.C., were Delphians. The encroachment and building on the land of Apollo, land that was supposed to be utterly bare, was the work of individual Delphians.

1. The evidence for the events during the archonship of Eukleidas (probably 125) is the series of documents published in *FDelphes* III.4.276–83.

2. The fragments of his letter: *SIG*^{3} 826A; *FDelphes* III.4 .276. Colin compares the letter of the praetor M. Aemilius to Mylasa, requesting the Mylasans to arbitrate between Magnesia and Priene (**120**). See Colin and Daux for narrative reconstructions of the course of events.

3. See *FDelphes* III.4.279, 283; Colin, *BCH* 27, pp. 138f., 158f.

4. *FDelphes* III.4.283. See Daux, *Delphes*, pp. 372f., 699–702; Lerat, p. 101.

5. II C, lines 3–4; Lerat, p. 101.

164. Lato and Olos turn to Knossos and Rome for arbitration (117/6–111/0)

A series of inscriptions found on Crete and on Delos relate the history of the conflicts between the two east Cretan states of Lato and Olos late in the second century B.C., and the settlement of their differences through arbitration.

I: Decree of Lato and Olos recording the mediation of Knossos and the decision to turn to Knossos for arbitration. Inscription discovered in 1903 on Delos; h: 0.37 m; w: 0.46 m; d: 0.10 m.

F. Dürrbach/A. Jardé, *BCH* 29 (1905) pp. 204–9, no. 67; Blass, *SGDI*, vol. 4, pp. 1034–35, no. 5; Schwyzer 195; Roussel/Launey, *Inscriptions de Délos* (Paris, 1937) 1514; *Guarducci, *IC* I.xvi, pp. 112–13, no. 3.

II: Renewed compact between Lato and Olos to submit to Knossian arbitration (A), with a rider to the effect that the Knossian arbitral authority is to be given a temporal extension (B). Inscription discovered in 1878 on Delos; h: 0.83 m; w: 0.39–0.43 m; d: 0.13 m.

T. Homolle, *BCH* 3 (1879) pp. 290–315; A. Semenoff, *Antiquitates iuris publici Cretensium* (Petrograd, 1893) pp. 119–21, App. II; Cauer^2 120; Berard 45; Blass, *SGDI* 5149; Dittenberger, *SIG*^{2} 514; Michel 28; Dittenberger/Hiller von Gaertringen, *SIG*^{3} 712; Dürrbach, *Choix d'inscriptions de Délos* (Paris, 1921) 111; Roussel/Launey, *Inscriptions de Délos* 1513; *Guarducci, *IC* I.xvi, pp. 113–14, no. 4. A Cretan copy of this agreement, with some minor variations, also exists and was published by van Effenterre, *REA* 44 (1942) pp. 34–35, a–b lines 1–41 (see document III).

III: The arbitral decision of the Knossians. Inscription, broken in three pieces, discovered at a sanctuary at Sta Lenika (Crete); h: 0.44 + 0.34 + 0.41 m; w: 0.53 m; d: 0.28 m. The stele also carries a copy of documents II and V.

*H. van Effenterre, *REA* 44 (1942) pp. 35–36, c lines 42–61.

IV: A fragmented inscription discovered in Athens, which may be connected to the settlement of differences between Lato and Olos. H: 0.4 m; w: 0.46 m; d: 0.18 m.

*B. D. Meritt, *Hesperia* 30 (1961) pp. 222–23, no. 19; *SEG* XXI.484 (after Meritt). Cf. Robert, *REG* 1962, 107.

V: A Roman ratification of the Knossian decision. On the same stele as document III.

*Van Effenterre, *REA* 44 (1942) p. 36, d lines 62–74.

VI: A Latian document referring to the demarcation of the borders of Lato and Olos by Milesian boundary commissioners. Also discovered at Sta Lenika (in 1937), but lost during World War II.

*H. van Effenterre/M. Bougrat, Κρητικὰ Χρονικά 21 (1969) pp. 28–29 (transcription of the text rather than a detailed edition).

VII: A fragment of a territorial demarcation recording the boundary between Lato and Olos, as well as that between Itanos and Hierapytna (cf. **158**). Inscription discovered at Lato; h: 0.23 m; w: 0.18 m.

S. Xanthoudides, *AE* 47 (1908) pp. 212f., no. 3; *Guarducci, *IC* I.xvi, pp. 134–36, no. 18.

Sonne 31; A. Wilhelm, *BCH* 29 (1905) *add.* p. 577; Maiuri, *RAL* 1910, pp. 109f.; Raeder 77, 78; Tod 52, 53; M. Guarducci, *IC* I, pp. 115–24; Robert, *REG* 1942, 140; H. van Effenterre, *REA* 44 (1942) pp. 31–51; M. Guarducci, *Epigraphica* 7 (1945) pp. 72–87; id., *Epigraphica* 9 (1947) pp. 32–35; Robert, *REG* 1948, 195; Broughton, vol. 1, pp. 536–38; R. F. Willetts, *Aristocratic Society in Ancient Crete* (London, 1955) p. 240; Robert, *REG* 1962, 107; R. F. Willetts, *Ancient Crete: A Social History* (London and Toronto, 1965) pp. 75, 156; Robert, *REG* 1968, 428; H. van Effenterre/M. Bougrat, Κρητικὰ Χρονικά 21 (1969) pp. 9–53; Robert, *REG* 1970, 466–67; S. Spyridakis, *Ptolemaic Itanos and Hellenistic Crete* (Berkeley, 1970) pp. 65–66; Robert, *REG* 1976, 553; J. Vélissaropoulos, *Les nauclères grecs* (Paris, 1980) pp. 161, 175–76, 210; M. Baldwin Bosky, *Hesperia* 58 (1989) pp. 331–47; Chaniotis, *Ktema*, pp. 23f.

I: Decree of Lato and Olos

Ἀγαθαῖ τύχαι. ἐπὶ τῶν Αἰθαλέων κοσμιόντων Κνωσοῖ μὲν τῶν
cὺν Κύδαντι [τ]ῶ Κύδαντος μηνὸς Ἐλχανίω, Λατοῖ δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν
cὺν Διοκλεῖ τῶ Ἡρώ⟨ι⟩δα μηνὸς Βακινθίω, ἐν δὲ Ὀλόντι τῶν cὺν Τη-
λεμάχῳ τῶ Γνώμιος μηνὸ[c] Α[γρια]νίω, πρειγευcάντων Κνωcίων
5 τᾶc πόλιος ἐπί τε τὰν τῶν Λατίων πόλιν καὶ ἐπὶ τὰν τῶν Ὀλοντί-
ων καὶ παρακαλεcάντων τὰμ μὲν ἐνεcτακυῖαν πορτ' ἀλλάλονc
διαφορὰν καὶ ἀμειξίανc ἄραι, περὶ δὲ τῶν ἀμφιλλεγομένων
πόλι πορτὶ πόλιν δόμεν αὐτοῖc τὰν ἐπιτροπάν. vac
ἔδοξε Λατίοις καὶ Ὀλοντίοις ἐπακολουθῆcαι καθὼc παρακα-
10 λίοντι Κνώcιοι· καὶ ἔδωκαν [τ]ὰν ἐπιτροπὰν πάντα περὶ
πάντων· κρινόντων δ' ἃ πόλιc τῶν Κνωcίων οἵ κα ἐπὶ Κύδαν-
τοc κοcμιῶντι ἐν δεκαμήν[ωι] ἅ κα αὐτοῖc δοκῇ δίκαια ἦμεν·
τὰ δὲ κριθέντα καὶ ἀναγραφέ[ντα] ὑπὸ τῶν Κνωcίων βέβαι[α]
καὶ κύρια ἦμεν ἐc τὸν ἅπαντα [χρό]νον καὶ μηκέτι ὑπολεί-
15 πεcθαι αὐτοῖc ἔγκλημα μηθὲμ [παρ]ευρέcει μηδεμιᾶι· καὶ ἀν-
γραφήτω τὰ εὐδοκημένα κα . . . . εντα Κνωcοῖ μὲν ἐν τ[ῶι]
ἰαρῶι τῶ Ἀπόλλωνοc τῶ Δελφι[δίω] καὶ ἐν τῶι ἰαρῷ τῶ Ἄρεοc
[τῶι] Δέρᾳ ἐν cτάλαι, Λατοῖ δὲ ἐν [τῶι] ἰαρῶι τᾶc Ἐλευθυίαc, ἐ[ν δὲ]

[Ὀλόντ]ι ἐν τῶι ἰαρῷ τῶ Ζηνὸς τῶ [Ταλλ]αίω, ᵛ ἐν δὲ [Δ]ά[λωι]
[ἐν τῶι ἰαρῶι τῶ Ἀπόλλω]νος· ᵛ δό[ντων] δὲ Λάτιοι [καὶ Ὀλόν]-
[τιοι τούτω τῶ ἐγγρόφω ἑκά]τερο[ι χέρα] τᾶι τῶ[ν Κνωσίων πόλι]
[καὶ αὐτοσαυτοῖς· ὑπὲρ δὲ] το[ῦδε τῶ ἐγγρό]φω ἑ[ς Δᾶλον ἀποστη]-
[λάντων -]

7: ἀμειξίαν cᾶραι: Dürrbach/Jardé, Fränkel. ἀμειξίαν{c}ᾶραι: Wilhelm, Roussel/Launey. ἀμειξίανς ᾶραι: Schwyzer.

II: Decree of Lato and Olos

A Ἀγαθᾶι τύχαι. πρειγευσάντων Κνωσίων τᾶς πόλιος ἐπὶ τὰς πόλεις τάν τε τῶν Λατίων καὶ τῶν Ὀλοντίων καὶ παρκαλεσάντων δόμεν αὐτοῖς ἐξαρχίδιον τὰν ἐπιτροπὰν περὶ ὧν καὶ πρὸ τῶ, ἔδοξε Λατίοις καὶ Ὀλοντίοις κοινᾶι βωλευσαμένοις, ἐπὶ κόσμων Κνωσοῖ μὲν τῶν cὺν Νενναίω⟨ι⟩ τῶ Μοψείω, μηνὸς Σπερμίω δευτέραι, Λατοῖ δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν cὺν Διοκλεῖ τῶ Ἡρώιδα, μηνὸς Θιοδαιcίω δευτέραι, ἐν δὲ Ὀλόντι τῶν cὺν Μενοντίδαι τῶ Ἀκάccονος, μηνὸς Ἐλευcυνίω δευτέραι, δόμεν τὰν ἐπιτροπὰν Λατίος καὶ Ὀλοντίος τᾶι τῶν Κνωσίων πόλι περὶ τῶν ἀμφιλλεγομένων αὐτοῖς πόλι πορτὶ πόλιν πάντα περὶ πάντων, καὶ θέμεν στάλαν ἐν ἁμέραις τριάκοντα, Κνωσοῖ μὲν ἐν τῶι ἰαρῶι τῶ Ἀπόλλωνος τῶ Δελφιδίω καὶ ἐν τῶ ἰαρῶι τῷ Δέραι, Λατοῖ δὲ ἐν τῶι τᾶς Ἐλευθυίας, ἐν δὲ Ὀλόντι ἐν τῶι ἰαρῶι τῶ Ζηνὸς τῶ Ταλλαίω, ἄλλαν δὲ κοινᾶι ἐν Δάλωι ἐν τῶι ἰαρῶι τῶ Ἀπόλλωνος. ὑπὲρ δὲ τούδε τῶ τιθεμένω ἐνγρόφω ἐς Δᾶλον ἀποστηλάντων οἵ τε Κνώcιοι καὶ οἱ Λάτιοι καὶ οἱ Ὀλόντιοι πορτὶ τὸν ἐπιμελητὰν πρειγείαν καὶ γράμματα ἐν ἁμέραις τριάκοντα, ὥστε στᾶ[cα]ι στάλαν ἐς ἃν ἀναγραφης[εῖ] τὰ δεδογμένα. καὶ ταῦτα ἔστω κύρια. κρινόντων δὲ οἱ Κνώcιοι ἐν ἑξαμήνωι ἄρχοντος μηνὸς Καρωνίω τῶ ἐπὶ Νενναίω{ι}, ὡς δὲ Λάτιοι ἄγοντι μηνὸς . αρτιωβιαρίω, ὡς δὲ Ὀλόντιοι ἄγοντι μηνὸς Δελφινίω. καὶ κύριοι ἔντων οἱ Κνώcιοι ἀνγράφοντ[ε]ν τὸ γενόμενον κρίμα ἐμ μὲν ταῖc ἐν Κρήτᾳ στάλαις ἐν ἁμέραις τριάκοντα, ἐc δὲ Δᾶλον ἐξαποστηλάντων ἐν ταῖc αὐταῖc ἁμέραις· εἰ δέ κα παργένηται ὁ πρειγευτὰc ὁ ἀπεcταλμένος [ὑ]πὸ τῶν Κνωcίων ἐc Δᾶλον, κύριος ἔcτω ἀγγράφων ἐc τὰν αὐτὰν στάλαν τὸ κρίμα. τὰ δὲ κριθέντα καὶ ἀγγραφέντα ὑπὸ τῶν Κνωcίων βέβαια καὶ κύρια ἦμεν ἐc τὸν πάντα χρόνον, καὶ μηκέτι ὑπολείπεcθαι αὐτοῖc περὶ μηθενὸc ἔνκλημα μηθὲν παρευρέcει μηδεμιᾶι. δόντων δὲ Λάτιοι καὶ Ὀλόντιοι τούτω τῶ ἐγγρόφω ἑκάτεροι χέρα τᾶι τῶν Κνωcίων πόλι καὶ αὐτοcαυτοῖc. ἐγγύοc δὲ καταcτacάντων ἐν ἁμέραις εἴκοcι Κνωcίοc διὰ τῶ Κνωcοῖ χρεωφυλακίω ὑπὲρ τούτω τῶ ἐγγρόφω οἵ τε Λάτιοι καὶ οἱ Ὀλόντιοι τοῖc Κνωcίοις ἑκάτεροι ἀργυρίω Ἀλεξανδρείων ταλάντων δέκα [ἐ]φ' [ᾧ]ι ἐμμενίοντι ἐν τούτῳ τῷ ἐγγρόφῳ καὶ ἐν τοῖc κριθένcι ὑπὸ τᾶc πόλε[ο]c. ὁπότεροι δὲ μὴ ἐμμένοιεν, τὰν

πρᾶξιν ἦμεν ἐκ τῶν ἐγγύων, καὶ οἱ τῶν Κνωσίων κόσμοι πράξαντες ἀποδόντων τοῖς ἐμμένον[c]ι, καὶ πάντως ἔστω τὰ κριθέντα κύρια. ἔντων δὲ οἱ ἔγγυοι μέστα κα ἡ κρίσις ἐπιτελεσθῆι καὶ ἀγγραφῆι καθὼς προγέγραπται. εἰ δὲ τί κα δόξῃ ὕστερον ταῖς πόλεσι Κνωσίοις καὶ Λατίοις καὶ Ὀλοντίοις ἢ πορτιγράψαι ἢ ἀφελὲν, ταῦτα ἔστω κύρια.

vacat

B Ἀγαθαῖ τύχαι. ἐπὶ Καραπίωνος ἄρχοντος, μηνὸς Πυανοψιῶνος. ὁ παραγενόμενος πρεσβευτὰς παρὰ τᾶς πόλεος τᾶς Κνωσίων Ἀγησίπολις Ἀγαθάνδρω ποτανέγραψε τὸ ὑποτεταγμένον ψάφισμα, συνευ{ε}δοκιόντων καὶ τῶν παραγενομένων πρεσβευτᾶν, παρὰ μὲν τᾶς Λατίων πόλεος Ἀρισστάνδρω τῶ Γλαυκία, παρὰ δὲ τᾶς Ὀλοντίων πόλεος Ἰκαδίωνος τῶ Ἀρχικώμω, κατὰ τὰ ἀποδοθέντα ποτὶ τὸν ἐπιμελητὰν παρὰ τᾶν πόλεων γράμματα. ἔδοξε Λατίοις καὶ Ὀλοντίοις κοινᾶι βουλευσαμένοις, συνευδοκησάντων καὶ Κνωσίων, ἀμβαλὲν ὑπερθεμένοις κατὰ τὰν ἐπιτροπὰν τὸν προγραμμένον χρόνον ἐν τᾶι στάλαι, τὸν ἐπὶ Νενναίω{ι}Κνωσοῖ κόσμω καὶ Διοκλεῖος Λατίω καὶ Μενοντίδα Ὀλοντίω· ἐγγράψαι δὲ ὥστε κυρίος ἦμεν κρίνοντας Κνωσίος ἐν μηςὶν δεκαδύο, ἄρχοντος μηνὸς Νεκυσίω ἐπὶ Ἀγήμονος Κνωσοῖ κόσμω, Λατοῖ δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν cὺν Κυδάννωι τῶι Ἐνίπαντος, μηνὸς Θεσμοφορίω, ἐν δὲ Ὀλόντι ἐπὶ τῶν cὺν Ἀντικλεῖ τῶ{ι}Εὐβώλω{ι}μηνὸς Ἀπελλαίω. δόντων δὲ Λάτιοι καὶ Ὀλόντιοι τούτω τῶ ἐνγρόφω ἑκάτεροι χέρα τᾶι τῶν Κνωσίων πόλει καὶ αὐτοσαυτοῖς.

3: ἐξ ἀρχιδί⟨ω⟩ν: Homolle. Van Effenterre suggests perhaps ἐξ ἀκεραίων. || 5: the stone has ΝΕΝΝΑΙΩΝ. || 15–16: ὑπὲρ δὲ τού|τω: Roussel/Launey. || 21: Νενναίωι: *SIG*^{3}, Roussel/Launey. || 22: Χαρτιωβιαρίω?: Roussel/Launey. || 38: ἐμμένον[τ]ι: Homolle. The Cretan copy of these documents published by van Effenterre shows some minor variations, a few of which are noted here. 1: Θ I O I ΑΓΑΘΑΙΤΥΧΑΙ. || 5: Νενναίῳ. || 18–19 (14 in the Cretan copy): ὥστε σταθῆι στάλα ἐς ἂν ἀγγραφῆι τὰ δεδογμένα. || 22 (16 in the Cretan copy): Σαρτιωβιαρίω. || Lines 42–50, which form a preamble from the Delian point of view to the rider (B), are not found in the Cretan copy. || 61 (41 in the Cretan copy): πόλι.

III: The Knossian judgement

ΚΡΙΜΑ ΚΝΩΣΙΩΝ

ἔκρινε ἃ τῶν Κνωσίων πόλις περὶ ὧν ἐπέδωκε δικάσαι ᾗ [τῶν Λα]τ[ίων] πόλις τᾶι τῶν Ὀλο̣ν[τ]ίων πόλι χώρας τ̣ε̣ καὶ τῶ ἱαρῶ τῶ Δέραι καὶ τ[ῶν] θιγγανόντων τῶι ἱαρῶι τ̣ε̣μενίων πάντων καὶ τᾶς νάcω Πύρρας καὶ τῶ ποτίοντος cκοπέλω καὶ τᾶς νάος τετρήρεος καὶ τῶ[ν] ἐ̣ς̣ τᾶς [ν]άος ἀργυρωμάτων καὶ ἀ[ργ]υ̣ρ̣[ίω] ν̣ο̣μ̣ί̣c̣μ̣ατος καὶ χαλκωμά[των] καὶ ἄλ-

λων σκευῶν παντοδάπων καὶ σωμάτων τῶν πραθέντων ἐλευθέ-
ρων δύων καὶ οἰκέτα ἑνός· ἦμεν Λατίων καὶ τὰν νᾶσον Πύρραν καὶ
τὸν πορτίοντα σκόπελον καὶ τὰν χώραν τ[ὰ]ν [Κρ]ῆσαν καὶ τὸ ἱαρὸν τὸ Δέ-
ραι καὶ τὰ θιγγάνοντα τῶι ἱαρῶι τεμένια π̣άν[τα], ὅ̣π̣ως αὐτοῖς οἱ ὅροι
ἔσονται οἱ ἀρχαῖοι· ἀπὸ θαλάσσας ἐς Πλυ[μ]ῶν' ἀρράχιν ἐπὶ τὸ ἀρ-
χαῖον Ἀφροδίσιον καὶ τούτω ὡς τῶ Δεραίω θίνω τῶ τεμένιος οἱ ὅροι
[οἱ·ἐς τὸ]ν βορέαν ἔχ[οντ]ες κῆς τὰν Αἰρέπω κῆς τὰν Προμενήτισσαν κ̣ή̣π̣ι̣
[τᾶς Καλ]ολά[κκας τὰν περίβας]ιν κῆς Ἀρχελάρχαν ἐς τὰν Δηράδα παρ τῷ̣ν̣
[πρίνω]ν̣ [κῆς Ἀκά]μ̣[αντα· περὶ δὲ] τᾶς νάος καὶ τῶν ἐς τᾶς νάος ἀργυρω-
μάτων [καὶ]
[ἀ]ργ̣υ̣ρίω νομίς[ματος καὶ χαλκω]μ̣ά̣τ̣ω̣ν̣ καὶ ἄ̣λ̣λ̣ων σκευῶν πάντων καὶ σω-
[μ]άτων τῶν πραθ[έ]ν̣[των ἐλευθέρων δύων καὶ οἰκέτα] ἑνός, ἔκριναν ἅ̣π̣[αν]τ̣α
[ἦμ]εν Ὀλοντίων α̣ . . . c. 30 . . . σ̣ι̣αι δικαι περὶ
- - -ο . τ . ἀργυρι . . . c. 25 . . . σαι μνὰς ἀργ̣υ̣ρείας τρι-
άκοντα πέντε ἐπὶ . . . σιφάνιος τῶ Κο . . . . . μηνὸς Βακινθίω. vac

IV: Inscription from Athens

- -α αὐτοῖς ε- - - - - - - -
- -οντες καὶ αὐτ- - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -ᾳ̣ς̣έων τὰν φιλί[αν - - - - - -]
- - - - - - - - - - -ε̣ λαμΙ[- - - -τ]αῖς πόλεσιν συντε[λεῖν - - -]
- - - - -ι περὶ τοῦ κυριεύ[ει]ν τᾶς ἰδίας πατρίδος ἀπ[άσας - - - -]
- - - - - νόμοι νομίζων ἅπ[ας]ιν ἀνθρώποις συμφέρε[ιν - - - - -]
- - - - -θα[ι· π]ερὶ δὲ τῶν χρημάτων ὧν ἀξιοῦντι βο[- - - - - ἀ]-
[ν]ηλοῦν ἅπαντα ποτὶ τοὺς φίλους πραγμα- - - - - - - - - - -
[μ]εγάλας, νόμους ἐθήκατο περὶ τῶν πρ- - - - - - - - - - - - -
. ᾳ̣σων δὲ πάντα γεν[έ]σθαι ε̣ὐβ̣- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
αν καὶ καθάπερ ἐν τὰν ἰδίαν ἀ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
[σ]θαι καὶ τιμὰς τούτοις ε- -
σι τοῖς τὰ χρήματα σ- -
ησάσθων παραχρ- -
αν ἢ δανε[ίζειν -]
. ομε- -

3: [Μυλ]ᾳ̣σ̣έων (for example): Robert. || 7: ἀξιοῦντι Βο[λοέντιοι]: Robert.

V: Roman ratification of the Knossian judgement

ΑΓΑΘΑΙ ΤΥΧΑΙ

ἀπόκριμα τῶν ἐγ Ῥώμης πρειγεύταν, Κοίντω Φαβίω Μαξίμω, Κοίντω
υἱῶ, Γαίω Φαννίω, Γαίω υἱῶ, Ποπλίω Ροτιλίω, Ποπλίω υἱῶ, Κοίντω Πλω-
[τ]ίω, Ἀ̣ῦλω υἱῶ, Μαάρκω Δομετίω, Ποπλίω υἱῶ· ΚΡΙΜΑΤΟΣ
Λ̣ατίοις καὶ Ὀλοντίοις καὶ τῷ̣ ἱαρεῖ· ἡμεῖς ὁ Κνώσιοι ἔκριναν
Λ̣ατίοις καὶ Ὀλοντίοις διὰ ταύτην τὴν αἰτίαν εἰς ἀκέραιον ἀποκατεστής[α]-
[μ]εν ὅτι ὁμόλογον ἦν ἑκατέροις τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα κατὰ τὸμ πόλεμον γεγεν̣η-

μένον, ὧι καιρῶι Λάτιοι Κνωσίων, Ὀλόντιοι Γορτυνίων σύμμαχοι ἦσαν· ἵνα τοῦ-
το τὸ πρᾶγμα ἐξ ἀκεραίων διακούσωμεν, Ὅ ΚΡΙΜΑ ΚΝΩΣΙΟΙ
[Λ]α[τ]ίοις καὶ Ὀλοντίοις ἔκριναν περὶ τῆς χώρας· ἃ ὅρια ἔκριναν, ταῦτα τὰ ὅρια εὐδ̣οκεῖ ἑστηκότα εἶναι· ὁποτέροις δὲ ἐν ὁρίοις ἱερὸν Ἄρεος ἐν
[τ]ῆι Δ̣[ερ]αίαι ἐστὶν καὶ ἡ χώρα τούτου τοῦ ἱεροῦ, ἐκείνου τοῦ δήμου ἐπιμελείαν δοκεῖ εἶναι. vac

72–73: van Effenterre suggests ἐν| [τ]ῆι Δ̣[ερ]αίαι (*sc.* γῆι).

VI: The Milesian boundary commission

[Ἀ]ΓΑΘ]ΑΙ ΤΥΧΑΙ
[ἐπὶ τῶν Ἐχανορέων κοσμ]ιόντων τῶν σὺν Αὐτίωνι
[τῶ Ποδαίθωνος, ἁ πόλις τ]ᾶι παστάδι τὰν ὀρόφᾳ̣ν
[ἐπέθηκε καὶ τὰ θυρώματ]α ἐκο[νί]ασε καὶ τὸν περί-
[βολον ἐπωικοδόμη]σε καὶ οἱ ἐς Μιλήτο ὁροθέτα[ι]
[κατὰ τὸ τᾶς συγκλή]τω δόγμα τὸς ὅρος κατέστη-
[σαν τᾶς κατακ]εκριμένας χώρας κα[ὶ] γ̣ασῶν χ̣[αὶ]
[τῶ ἰαρῶ? ἀκο]λούθ[ω]ς τοῖς προγεγονόσι
[κρίμασι. ἐκόσμιον οἵδε· Α]ὐτίων Ποδαίθω-
[νος, Θίαρις Λάστωνος, Σώμαντις Λ]άστωνος, Χέ-
[νος Ἐνίπαντος, Σόφιο]ς Κλεάνορος,
[Πράξων Κολάκα, Πολύτιμ]ος Πολυτίμω
[γραμματεὺς Πολύτιμος] Ἀνδρολᾶ.

VII: Boundary delimitation

[- καὶ περιαπ]έτις ἃι αἱ
[στεφάναι κὴς τὰν Δανάπαρξον καὶ ἐς τὰν Αἴγυρον ἃι αἱ στεφάναι κὴς Παμ-
φυρί]ασον ἐς τὰν
[ὁδὸν τὰν δαμοσίαν κὴς τὸν Ἐπαθέντα κατὰ ῥάχιν ἐς C]υδάφνας
[τὰς ἄνω καὶ κατὰ ποταμὸν ἐς Κορδωΐλαν καὶ ἂν ῥάχιν ἐς Λαγινάπ]υτον ἐπὶ τὸ
[ἄντρον κὴς Καλλιόρασον ἐπὶ τὸ ἄντρον κῆς Μεταλλάπυτον ἐπὶ τὸ]ν ποταμὸν
[κᾶν τὸν ῥόον ἐπὶ τὸ Στιώτιον καὶ τῶδε ἂν ῥάχιν ἐπὶ τὸν Ἀκάμαντα·] τᾶς δὲ ποτ' Ὀ-
[λοντίος χώρας· ἀπὸ θαλάσσας ἐς Πλυμῶν' ἂρ ῥάχιν ἐπὶ τὸ ἀρχαῖ]ον Ἀφρο-
δίσιον
[καὶ τουτῶ ΩΣΤΩΔΕΡΕΩΘΗΝΩ τῶ τεμένιος οἱ ὅροι οἱ ἐς τὸν βορέαν ἔ]χοντες κὴς τὰν ,
[Αἰρεπὼ κὴς τὰν Πρυμνίτισσαν κὴπὶ τᾶς Καλολάκκας τὰν π]ερίβασιν κὴς Ἀρχε-
[λάρχαν ἐς τὰν Δηράδα ἐπ' ἀρτίων πρίνων κὴς τὸν Ἀκά]μαντα καὶ νᾶσον Πυρ-
[- -]λ̣α τὰν Κρῆσαν vac
[- ὡς ὁ Σέδαμνος περιαπ]πέτις ἐς Καρύμας ἐς

[τὰν Δηράδα καὶ πέραν ἐc τὰν cτεφάναν καὶ ὡc ἁ cτεφάνα ἐ]c Δορθόνναν
ἐπὶ τ[ὸν]
[λάκκον καὶ ὡc ἁ ὁδὸc ποτὶ μecανβρίαν τὰν ὁδὸν τὰν ἄγω]can δί Ἀτ[ρῶνα]

Xanthoudides restored lines 1–11 of this inscription (the borders between Lato and Olos) from lines 64–72 of the inscription published in *IC* I.xvi.5 (a treaty of isopolity and alliance between Lato and Olos); lines 12–14 (the borders between Itanos and Hierapytna) were restored from the inscription reproduced in **158** (II, lines 59f.). The Lato-Olos boundary is also described in these terms in the Sta Lenika inscription (document III, lines 52–56).

In the final decades of the second century B.C. the city-states of eastern Crete were experiencing extensive turmoil connected to the hostility between Gortyn and Knossos, and their respective allies, Hierapytna and Olos (Gortyn) and Itanos and Lato (Knossos). Sporadic localized conflict from 121 B.C. on pitted Itanos against Hierapytna, as discussed in **158**; farther west, it was Lato and Olos who were enemies.[1] The first document reproduced here is a joint decree of the two states, in which they agreed to turn to the arbitration of Knossos to settle their disputes and resolve their hostility. It was discovered on Delos, where it had been inscribed in accordance with provisions laid down in the decree. Other copies were to be set up at Knossos, at Lato, and at Olos. Publication of such an agreement to turn to arbitration (the *compromissum*) at international neutral sites as well as in the states involved was not uncommon.[2] The decision of Lato and Olos to turn to arbitration was made in response to an initiative from Knossos. Knossos had sent embassies to the two poleis in an effort to get them to settle their differences. The Latians and Olontians then agreed to submit all the points of dispute between their cities to the Knossians for arbitration. This arbitration was to be carried out in the same year, within a period of ten months to be exact. The Knossian judgement was to be final and binding, and to remain in effect for all time. No further claims or charges would be acceptable.

The second document, copies of which have been found both on Delos and on Crete, is very similar in tone to the first. It too is a joint decree of Lato and Olos, agreeing, in the wake of a Knossian embassy, to submit to the arbitration of that state. It is not, however, the same decree as document I. The time frame appears to be slightly different: while the same man, Diokles, is *kosmos* at Lato in both documents, the *kosmoi* of Knossos and of Olos are different. Furthermore, the second document is more detailed than the first in terms of the provisions surrounding the arbitration. This document also has a later rider attached to it (II B). The Delian copy of this addition is dated by the Athenian archon Sarapion

1. See **158**. See Baldwin Bosky, *Hesperia* 58; van Effenterre, *REA* 44; and van Effenterre/Bougrat, Κρητικὰ Χρονικά 21, for the historical reconstruction of events.

2. Cf. **153**.

(116/5). Shortly after producing the agreement found in II A, then, Lato and Olos apparently decided, with the agreement of the Knossians, to extend the time limit for the arbitration to a period of a year. The arbitrators were therefore given an extra six months within which to deliver their verdict or verdicts. The first call for arbitration (I) had probably taken place in 117/6; the second (II) in 116/5. The additional six-month delay moved the deadline for Knossian arbitration from April 115 to October 115.[3] Interruptions and delays in carrying out the arbitration can probably be connected to an unresolved state of hostility on the island. War between Knossos and Gortyn broke out again c. 114, a war that drew in Gortyn's ally Olos and Knossos's ally Lato.

It is interesting to note that Knossos, the ally of one and the enemy of the other, remained a viable choice for arbitrator. Perhaps the conflicts were not all-consuming; the contemporary case of Itanos and Hierapytna suggests that what fighting there was took place on a largely local scale and tended to oppose neighbouring communities rather than full-scale military alliances. Olos, for example, may have contented itself with invading the territory traditionally disputed between it and Lato. Ties of military alliance to Knossos and Gortyn may have meant little in practical terms. The presence of Knossos as arbitrator also emphasizes Knossos's general significance and influence in the region. After its absorption of the territory of Dreros in the second century, Knossos had become the western neighbour of both Lato and Olos.

Until the discovery of the inscription from Sta Lenika, bearing the second *compromissum*, the Knossian judgement, and the Roman ratification, there was no evidence for the final decision of the Knossians or even the actual subject of the dispute between Lato and Olos. Document III reveals the findings of the Knossian judges, in which they summarized the points of dispute. Territory, as always, was a key factor. The Latians and Olontians disputed their borders with one another, including a temple at Dera and precincts bordering it. The ownership of an island called Pyrrha was also in question. But movable goods were in dispute as well: a ship, perhaps wrecked or captured by one side or the other, and its cargo, which consisted in part of precious metals and three potential slaves. The Knossian arbitrators awarded to Lato the island of Pyrrha, the temple at Dera, and all the precincts bordering it, as well as a piece of land called Kresa. Thus the Latians would have their ancestral borders restored. On the other hand, the ship and its goods were awarded to Olos, although Olos was required to pay financial compensation on the order of 35 mnai to Lato before the spring of 114.

The Knossian arbitration between Lato and Olos was not an unqualified success. Olos in particular would have had cause for dissatisfaction, a dissatisfaction that may have been exacerbated by the knowledge that Knossos had, after all,

3. See Baldwin Bosky, *Hesperia* 58, pp. 339f., for a chronology of these events.

been the ally of Olos's opponent Lato. Perhaps it was the Olontians, then, who turned elsewhere for a new judgement. The role of Rome in the renewed arbitration between Lato and Olos will be discussed below; but it seems possible that the Cretan states did not turn to Rome first. It has been argued that the fragmentary Doric inscription from Athens (IV) preserves the dialectal form of the name of the Olontians.[4] Its discovery at Athens might suggest an Athenian involvement in the hostility between Lato and Olos.

Far more certain than the dubious Athenian connection with the continued Lato-Olos dispute is the role eventually played by the Romans. The Sta Lenika inscription not only records the Roman involvement (V); it enables us to determine that the same commission that investigated the dispute between Itanos and Hierapytna (**158**) also heard the arguments of the Latians and Olontians. In 113, Q. Fabius Maximus headed a delegation to Crete to investigate the troubled states of the eastern part of the island.[5] That the local disputes had wider ramifications is clear from the Roman concern to settle them, as well as from the evidence pointing to a pattern of alliances that, for example, opposed Lato to both Olos, its northern neighbour, and Hierapytna, to the south, during the time when Olos and Hierapytna were allied to Gortyn. It is significant that the fragment of a boundary settlement cited above (VII) combines on the same stone the boundaries of Lato and Olos and those of Itanos and Hierapytna. Whether or not this particular drawing of the borders was achieved through the arbitrations of the late second century, it is clear that it forms part of the same picture, the effort to bring some order out of the chaos in eastern Crete during these years.

The Roman involvement in the dispute between Lato and Olos may have entailed the formulation of a *senatus consultum* on the subject, if document VI is to be connected to this case. According to this fragmentary inscription from Sta Lenika, a group of Milesian boundary commissioners carried out the actual task of setting up the boundary markers on the disputed land.[6] These men were said to have done their work in accordance with a Roman edict, one that no doubt supported the Knossian arbitration ratified by Fabius's legation.[7] Miletos may have been asked to provide this boundary commission in order to offset any

4. See Robert, *REG* 1962, 107. Cf. *IG* II^2 1135 (cited in **165**), also found in Athens.

5. See Broughton, vol. 1, pp. 536–38, on the probable date of Fabius's embassy to Crete.

6. Van Effenterre and Bougrat point out a fragment of an inscription from Lyttos (unedited; transcription *ap.* Κρητικὰ Χρονικά 21, pp. 32–33 n. 36) that may also refer to the Milesian boundary commission; as they rightly point out, however, it is far too fragmentary to offer any certainty.

7. The Magnesian tribunal that arbitrated between Itanos and Hierapytna around the same time was also given its mandate through a *senatus consultum* (**158**). The senate formulated that *senatus consultum* in part through the information on Crete provided by Fabius; perhaps the same senatorial edict mandated both the Magnesians and the Milesians.

question of partiality. Knossos's arbitration was apparently eventually accepted, but its role as arbitrator may not have been completely satisfactory, to Olos at least. The choice of the Milesians may have been a concession to the Olontians.

The Milesians carried out their work in 111/0, the Latian *kosmos*-year of Aution, the same year that Lato formulated a treaty with Hierapytna (**32** Appendix), and Olos one with Lyttos (**165**). By that year, so far as we are able to tell, the dispute between Lato and Olos had been settled. In 112 or 111 the quarrel between their neighbours, Itanos and Hierapytna, was also resolved. Peace may have been established through the region. No further evidence survives for boundary disputes and arbitration; and it is possible that Lato and Olos took the opportunity to conclude a treaty of alliance and isopolity.[8]

165. Lyttos and Olos conclude a treaty with the help of Athens and Rhodes (?) (111/0)

Two fragmented inscriptions that contain copies of the same document, a treaty between Lyttos and Olos.

I: The Athenian copy, found on the acropolis, consisting of three separate fragments (A, B, and C).

Blass, *SGDI* 5147; A. Wilhelm, *SAWW* 180 (1916) II, pp. 30f.; P. Deiters, *De Cretensium titulis publicis* (Bonn, 1904) 51; Kirchner, *IG* II^2 1135 (q.v. for epigraphic details) and *add.*; *Guarducci, *IC* I.xviii, pp. 187–89, no. 9.

II: The Rhodian copy, containing the oath of Lyttos. H: 0.30 m; w: 0.30 m; d: 0.069 m.

*V. Kontorini, *Rhodiaka* I (Louvain, 1983) pp. 29–42, no. 2; *SEG* XXXIII. 638; L. Vázquez, "Inscripciones rodias" (Diss., Madrid, 1988) 1408.

R. F. Willetts, *Aristocratic Society in Ancient Crete* (London, 1955) p. 240; id., *Ancient Crete: A Social History* (London and Toronto, 1965) p. 156; Robert, *REG* 1970, 464; Gawantka, p. 216; V. Kontorini, in *Les Cyclades* (Paris, 1983) p. 141; *SEG* XXXIII.134, 638; Robert, *REG* 1984, 289; E. Vouturas, *Hellenika* 36 (1985) pp. 342–43; *SEG* XXXVII.93, 698; Ager, *Historia* 40 (1991) p. 40.

I. The Athenian inscription

A Cυνθῆκαι Κρητῶν Λ[υττίων καὶ Βολοεντίων.]
ἐπὶ Cωcικράτου ἄρχοντος ἐπὶ τῆς [- - - - -oc - - - - -c πρυτανείας, ἧι - - -]
ροc Κριωεὺc ἐγραμμάτευεν, ᵛ ἀγα[θᾶι Τύχαι καὶ ἐπὶ cωτηρίαι, Λυττίων ἐν μὲν τᾶι ἄνω]
πόλι ἐπὶ τῶν Διφύλων κοcμιόν[των τῶν cὺν - - - - - τῶ - - - - - μηνὸc Πα]-

8. *IC* I.xvi.5.

question of partiality. Knossos's arbitration was apparently eventually accepted, but its role as arbitrator may not have been completely satisfactory, to Olos at least. The choice of the Milesians may have been a concession to the Olontians.

The Milesians carried out their work in 111/0, the Latian *kosmos*-year of Aution, the same year that Lato formulated a treaty with Hierapytna (**32** Appendix), and Olos one with Lyttos (**165**). By that year, so far as we are able to tell, the dispute between Lato and Olos had been settled. In 112 or 111 the quarrel between their neighbours, Itanos and Hierapytna, was also resolved. Peace may have been established through the region. No further evidence survives for boundary disputes and arbitration; and it is possible that Lato and Olos took the opportunity to conclude a treaty of alliance and isopolity.[8]

165. Lyttos and Olos conclude a treaty with the help of Athens and Rhodes (?) (111/0)

Two fragmented inscriptions that contain copies of the same document, a treaty between Lyttos and Olos.

I: The Athenian copy, found on the acropolis, consisting of three separate fragments (A, B, and C).

Blass, *SGDI* 5147; A. Wilhelm, *SAWW* 180 (1916) II, pp. 30f.; P. Deiters, *De Cretensium titulis publicis* (Bonn, 1904) 51; Kirchner, *IG* II^2 1135 (q.v. for epigraphic details) and *add.*; *Guarducci, *IC* I.xviii, pp. 187–89, no. 9.

II: The Rhodian copy, containing the oath of Lyttos. H: 0.30 m; w: 0.30 m; d: 0.069 m.

*V. Kontorini, *Rhodiaka* I (Louvain, 1983) pp. 29–42, no. 2; *SEG* XXXIII. 638; L. Vázquez, "Inscripciones rodias" (Diss., Madrid, 1988) 1408.

R. F. Willetts, *Aristocratic Society in Ancient Crete* (London, 1955) p. 240; id., *Ancient Crete: A Social History* (London and Toronto, 1965) p. 156; Robert, *REG* 1970, 464; Gawantka, p. 216; V. Kontorini, in *Les Cyclades* (Paris, 1983) p. 141; *SEG* XXXIII.134, 638; Robert, *REG* 1984, 289; E. Vouturas, *Hellenika* 36 (1985) pp. 342–43; *SEG* XXXVII.93, 698; Ager, *Historia* 40 (1991) p. 40.

I. The Athenian inscription

A Cυνθῆκαι Κρητῶν Λ[υττίων καὶ Βολοεντίων.]
ἐπὶ Cωcικράτου ἄρχοντος ἐπὶ τῆς [- - - - -oc - - - - -c πρυτανείας, ἧι - - -]
ροc Κριωεὺc ἐγραμμάτευεν, ᵛ ἀγα[θᾶι Τύχαι καὶ ἐπὶ cωτηρίαι, Λυττίων ἐν μὲν τᾶι ἄνω]
πόλι ἐπὶ τῶν Διφύλων κοcμιόν[των τῶν cὺν - - - - - τῶ - - - - - μηνὸc Πα]-

8. *IC* I.xvi.5.

νάμω ˅ κη΄, ˅ ἐν δὲ τᾶι ἐπὶ θαλά[ccαι πόλι ἐπὶ τῶν - - - - - κοcμιόντων τῶν]
cὺν Cωτάδᾳ τῶ Cωτάδα μη[νὸc - - - -, ἐν δὲ τᾶι Βολοεντίων πόλι ἐπὶ τῶν - - - -]
ων κοcμιόντων τῶν cὺν [- - - - - - τῶ - - - - - - μηνὸc - - - - - - πρειγευcάντων]
Βολοεντίων τᾶc πόλιος [ἐπὶ Λυττίων τάν τε ἄνω πόλιν καὶ τὰν ἐπὶ θαλάccαι περὶ φιλί]-
[α]c καὶ ἰcοπολιτείαc κ[αὶ cυμμαχίαc ὅπως ὑπάρχηι ταῖc πόλεcιν εἰc τῶν πάντα χρόνον],
[ἔδ]οξε Λυ[ττίοις -]

B . . . . . ιο . . . κι- -
[τ]ῶν δὲ καταλοίπῳ[ν -]
Λυττίοις καὶ καταγρα[- ἐξαγωγὰν δ' ἤμεν]
τοῖc τε Λυττίοις ἐc Β[ολόεντοc καὶ τοῖc Βολοεντίοις ἐκ Λύττου, κατὰ γᾶν μὲν ἀτελεῖ, κατὰ θά]-
λαccαν δὲ τὰ τέλια [καταβάλλονcι κατὰ τὸc ἑκατερᾶ κειμένος νόμος. ἤμεν δὲ]
καὶ τὰc ὁδὸc τὰc ξεν[ικὰc θίνας, τοῖc τε Λυττίοις ἐc Βολόεντα καὶ τοῖc Βολοεντίοις Λυτ]-
τόνδε. ˅ αἰ δέ τις κά τ[ινα ἀδικήcηι ἐν ταύταις ταῖc ὁδοῖc, ἀποτειcάτω ἑξαπλόα τὰ πρόc]-
τιμα δίκαι νικαθέ[c· ἐξορκιξάντων δὲ τὰν ἀγέλαν τὰν τόκα ἐcδυομέναν ἐν ἑκατέραι πό]-
λι οἱ κόcμοι ἐπ' αὐτῶν κ[οcμιόντων κατ' ἐνιαυτόν, παριόντων Λυττοῖ μὲν Βολοεντίων, Βολόεν]-
τι δὲ Λυττίων, τὸν ἐν τᾶι[δε τᾶι cυνθήκαι γεγραμμένον ὅρκον. ἐρπόντων δὲ καὶ ἐc τὰc ἑορτάc,]
[οἱ] μὲν Λύττιοι ἐc Βολόεν[τα ἔc τε τὰ - - - - - καὶ ἐc τὰ - - - - -, οἱ δὲ Βολ]-
[οέντ]ιοι Λυττόνδε ἔc [τε τὰ - - - - - - καὶ ἐc τὰ - - - - - - - - οἵ τε Βολοέν]-
[τιοι κ]αὶ οἱ Λύττιοι -
[. . . καὶ] θυόντων [- ἐμμένον]-
[τεc ἐν τ]αῖc προ- -
- - - - - - -π- -

C [- αἰ δὲ μὴ πράξαιεν]
[οἱ κόcμοι, ἀ]π[οτειcά]ντων cτατῆρας [πενταx]α[τίοc. πολιτεύεcθαι δὲ τόc τε Λυττίοc παρὰ]
[τοῖc Βολοε]ντ[ίοις κ]αὶ τὸc Βολοεντίοc [παρὰ τοῖc Λυττίοις - - - - - τὸν βωλόμε]-
[νον αὐτὸν τε] καὶ τ[έκ]να ἐπὶ τῶν νομι[ζομένων - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
- - - -οιc. ˅ ὅρκοc Λυττίων· [ὀμνύω τὰν Ἰcτίαν καὶ Τῆνα Κρηταγενέα καὶ Τῆνα]
[Ταλλαῖον κ]αὶ Τῆνα Βιδάταν καὶ Τῆνα [Μοννίτιον καὶ τὰν Ἥραν καὶ Ἀθαναίαν Πολιάδα καὶ]
[Ἀπόλλω]να Πύτ[ι]ον καὶ Λατὼν καὶ [Ἄ]ρτ[εμιν καὶ Ἄρια καὶ τὰν Ἀφροδίταν καὶ Ἑρμᾶν καὶ]
[Ἄλιον? κ]αὶ τὰν Βρ[ιτ]όμαρπιν καὶ τὸc ἄ[λλος θιὸc πάντας καὶ πάcας· ἢ μὰν ἐγὼ τοῖc Βολοεντίοις]

[ἐν τᾶι φι]λίᾳ καὶ [συ]μμαχίαι καὶ ἰσοπο[λιτείαι ἐμμενίω καὶ τοῖς ὅρκοις τοῖς ἐν τᾶιδε]
[τᾶι συ]νθήκαι γ[εγρ]αμμένοις ἐς τὸ[ν πάντα χρόνον ἁπλόως καὶ ἀδόλως, καὶ οὔ ποκα]
[προλειψί]ω τὸς Βολοεντίος οὔτ' ἐν πολέμ[ωι οὔτ' ἐν εἰρήναι, ἀλλὰ βοαθησίω παντὶ σθένει]
[ὥσπ]ερ ἐμὶν αὐτῶ[ι ὑ]πέρ τε θίνων κ[αὶ ἀνθρωπίνων πάντων καὶ οὐδὲν κακο]-
[τεχ]νησίω, καθώ[ς] κα συνθιώμεθα κα[ὶ] ὁ[μολογήσωμεν, καὶ οὐδενὶ ἄλλωι ἐκὼν καὶ γινώς]-
[κων ἐ]πιτραψίω π[αρε]υρέ[σει] οὐ[δ]εμιᾶ[ι οὐδὲ τρόπωι οὐδενί, καὶ τὸ δίκαιον δωσίω, καθώς]
[κα αἱ π]όλιες συ[νθίωνται. εὐο]ρκ[ί]ον[τι ἐμὶν] τό[ς τε θιός, τὸς ὤμοκα, ἰλέος ἦμεν]
[καὶ] ἦμεν πολ[λὰ καὶ ἀγαθά, ἐπιορ]κίο[ντι δὲ τὰ ἐναντία. ὅρκος Βολο]-
[ε]ντίων ὁ αὐ[τός.]

B 14: θυόντων [καὶ τἄλλα κατὰ τὸ νομιζόμενον]: Deiters. || 15: [ἐν τ]αῖς προ[ϋπαρχόνσαις στάλαις ταῖς ἰδίαι τεθένσαις Λατίοις καὶ 'Ολοντίοις?]: Deiters. || C 6: ['Απέλλων]α: Blass, Deiters. || C 10–15: [καὶ βουλευσίω τοῖς Βολοεντίοις| ὥσπ]ερ ἐμὶν αὐ[τῶι ὑ]πέρ τε θίνων κ[αὶ ἀνθρωπίνων· καθεξίω δὲ τάδε πάντα καὶ οὐδὲν κακο]|τεχνησίω καθώ[ς κα] συνθιώμεθα καὶ ο[ὐδ]ε[νὶ ἄλλωι ἐκὼν καὶ γινώσκων - -| . . ἐπ]ι[τ]ραψίω π[αρευ]ρές[ει οὐδ]εμιᾶ[ι καὶ ἐμμενίω ἐν τοῖς συνκειμένοις ὅρκοις καθώς κα| αἱ πό]λιες συ[νθίωνται· καὶ ὄ]ρκον ἄ[λλο]ν [τ]ο[ύτω κυριώτερον οὐ θησίω· εὐορκίοντι μὲν| ἦμ]εν πολλ[ὰ κἀγαθά, ἐφιορ]κ[ίον]τ[ι δὲ τὰ ἐναντία - -]: Vouturas's suggested restoration (based on the Rhodian copy). Cf. Kontorini, *Rhodiaka,* pp. 36–37.

II: The Rhodian inscription

"Ο[ρκος Λυττίων]
ὀμνύω τὰν 'Ιστίαν κ̣α̣[ὶ Τ̣ῆ̣ν]α Κρητα[γενία καὶ Ἀθαναίαν Πολιάδα καὶ Τ̣ῆ̣να] Βιδάταν καὶ Τ̣ῆ̣να Ταλλαῖον καὶ "Ηραν κ̣α̣[ὶ Ποσειδᾶν καὶ Ἀμφιτρίταν] κἀπόλλωνα Πύττιον καὶ Λατὼν κἄρταμιν κα[ὶ Ἄρεα καὶ Ἀφροδίταν καὶ 'Ερ]-
μᾶν καὶ Κωρ̣ῆ̣τας καὶ Νύμφας καὶ τὰν Βριτόμα[πριν καὶ τὸς ἄλλος θιὸς πάν]-
τας καὶ πάσας. ᵛ ἢ μὰν ἐγὼ ἐμμενίω ἐν τᾶι [φιλίαι καὶ συμμαχίαι καὶ ἰσοπολι]-
τείᾳ καὶ ἐπιγαμίαι καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις πᾶσι τοῖς ἐ[ν τᾶι συνθήκαι γεγραμμένοις] ἐς τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον ἁπλόως καὶ ἀδόλως κ[αὶ οὔ ποκα προλειψίω τὸς Βολο]-
εντίος οὔτ' ἐν πολέμωι οὔτ' ἐν εἰρήναι καὶ βουλ̣[ευσίω τοῖς Βολοεντίοις ὥς]-
περ ἐμὶν αὐτῶι ὑπέρ τ̣ε θί̣ν̣[ω]ν κ̣ἀνθρωπ̣[ίνω]ν καθεξί̣[ονσι τὸς ὅρκος καὶ οὐ κακοτεχνησίω],
καθώς κα συνθιώμεθα κα[ὶ - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - οὐκ ἐπιτραψίω πα]-
ρευρέσει οὐδεμιᾶι καὶ ἐμ̣μ̣[ε]νίω ἐ[ν τοῖ]ς̣ συνκε[ι]μ̣έ̣[νοις ὅρκοις καθώς κα συνθι]-
ώμεθα· καὶ ὅρκον ἄλλον τούτ[ῳ] κυριώ[τ̣ε̣]ρ̣ον οὐ θησίω· [εὐορκίοντι μὲν ἦμεν πολλὰ κἀγα]-
θά, ἐφιορκίοντι δὲ τὰ ἐναντία. ᵛ ὅρκος Βο[λοεντίων ὁ αὐτός].

15 πρε⟨ι⟩γευταὶ Λυττίων Χαιρύλος Βίεω, Μόνας Ἀρι[στία, - - - - - - - - - - -]
καὶ Βολοεντίων Πρώταρχος Πρωτάρχ[ου - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]

9–14: - - καὶ βουλ[ευσίω τοῖς Βολοεντίοις ὥς]|περ ἐμὶν αὐτῶι ὑπέρ τε θίν[ω]ν
κἀνθρωπ̣[ίνω]ν· καθεξί[ω δὲ τάδε καὶ οὐ κακοτεχνησίω]| καθώς κα συνθιώμεθα
κα[ὶ οὐδενὶ ἄλλωι ἐκὼν καὶ γινώσκων ἐπιτραψίω πα]|ρευρέσει οὐδεμιᾶι καὶ
ἐμμ[ε]νίω ἐ[ν τοῖ]ς συνκε[ι]μέ[νοις ὅρκοις καθώς κα συνθι]|ώμεθα· καὶ ὅρκον
ἄλλον τούτ[ω] κυριώ[τε]ρον οὐ θησίω· [εὐορκίοντι μὲν ἦμεν τάγα]|θά, ἐφιορ-
κίοντι δὲ τὰ ἐναντία - -: Vouturas's suggested restoration.

These two inscriptions, one from the Athenian acropolis, the other from Rhodes, are copies of a treaty sworn between the east Cretan states of Olos and Lyttos. The Athenian copy, dated by reference to the Athenian archon Sosikrates, enables us to determine that the treaty was concluded in the year 111/0. The Olontians evidently approached the state of Lyttos with the purpose of establishing a treaty of friendship, alliance, and *isopoliteia*. The Lyttians agreed, and the extant portions of the document lay down the rights and privileges the members of the two states were to have vis-à-vis each other, as well as the oath they were to swear. There is nothing in the text of the treaty itself (as we have it) that unequivocally points to the presence of a mediating third party in these negotiations. But the provenance of the two inscriptions and the dating of the Athenian copy by an Athenian archon strongly suggest that both Athens and Rhodes played a role in the conclusion of this treaty.[1] Furthermore, the time frame and the identity of the Cretan states suggest that the involvement of arbitrators was not unlikely. In the second to last decade of the second century Olos and several of its neighbours were settling their disputes by arbitration.[2] In 113 a Roman commission under Q. Fabius Maximus visited Crete to investigate the troubles between Itanos and Hierapytna, Lato and Olos (**158**, **164**). It is possible, although there is no direct evidence other than the synchronicity, that Fabius recommended arbitration to Olos in its relations with Lyttos as well, perhaps referring the two states to the good offices of Athens and Rhodes. The treaty as we have it does not suggest the settlement of significant outstanding difficulties. Friendly mediation may have been all that was required to enable the two states to formulate an amicable treaty.

1. One of the inscriptions documenting the Magnesian arbitration between Itanos and Hierapytna was discovered at Magnesia (**158**, II B).

2. See **158**, **164**, **32** Appendix (?). The latter example is a treaty between Lato and Hierapytna, discovered at Lyttos. Lyttos may have played some mediatory role in the formulation of the Lato-Hierapytna treaty; but the discovery of a copy of the treaty in a neighbouring Cretan state does not seem so clear an indication of mediation as does the discovery of fragments of the present treaty in such faraway places as Athens and Rhodes.

166. An arbitration over the Euboian Amphiktyonic vote (c. 110)

A series of fragments from the Theban treasury at Delphi (inv. nos. 2954, 2955, and 2958). H (combined): 0.745 m; w (max.): 0.8 m; d: 0.18 m. A further fragment was discovered later (6384); h: 0.31 m; w: 0.31 m; d: 0.22 m. The inscription consists of two separate columns (A and B). The later fragment fills out part of B.

H. Pomtow, *Klio* 15 (1918) pp. 15–20, nos. 39–40; id., *Klio* 18 (1923) 40 XIV; *SEG* II.276; *E. Bourguet, *FDelphes* III.1.578 (2954, 2955, and 2958); *J. Bousquet, *BCH* 64–65 (1940–41) pp. 113–20 (6384).

A. Wilhelm, *AAWW* 59 (1922) p. 9; Daux, *Delphes,* pp. 341–43; Robert, *REG* 1942, 80; id., *REG* 1968, 414; O. Picard, *Chalcis et la confédération eubéenne* (Paris, 1979) pp. 224–25; Robert, *REG* 1981, 293.

A: Column I of *FDelphes* III.1.578

[Ἐκ τῶν ὑπομνηματισμῶν τῶν ἐν τῆ πα]ρε[ρχομ]ένη πενταετηρίδι συντελ[ου]-
μ[ένω]ν . . ἐπὶ Βαβύλου
[ἄρχοντος ἐν Δελφοῖς, κρίματος γεγονό]τος [κα]ὶ τῶν παρὰ Ἐρετριέων
πρεσβ[ευτ]ῶ[ν] καὶ παρὰ Καρυστί-
[ων πρὸς τοὺς Ἀμφικτίονας παρα]γενομένων καὶ ἀντιλεγόντων πᾶ[σι]ν καὶ οὐ
φαμένων γε-
[γονέναι τὴν κρίσιν ἑαυτοῖς ἀπ]ὸ παντὸς τοῦ βελτίστου ἐν τῆ Ὑπάτη, οἱ
Ἀμφικτίονες ἔδωκαν
5 [αὐτοῖς ἐπιστολὴν εἰς Ὑπαταίους] ὥστε κριθῆναι πότερον γέγονεν ἡ κρίσις ἐν
τῆ Ὑπάτη [κατ]ὰ τὸ βέλ-
[τιστον ἢ δεῖ ἄκυρον γίγνεσθαι] τὴν κρίσιν ἐν ἀνδράσιν τριάκοντα ἐνὶ κλήρου
γενομένου· τῶν δὲ
[ἄλλων δικαστῶν ἐν τῆ Ὑπάτη χειρο]τονηθέντων ἀριστίνδην ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου
καὶ χρ[όν]ον ὁρισάντων
[περὶ ὧν οἱ Ἀμφικτίονες ἔγρ]αψαν, πάλιν ἐνί[κ]ησαν Χαλκιδεῖς καθότι καὶ ἡ
γραφ[ε]ῖσα ὑπὸ [τῶν Ὑπα]-
[ταίων ἀρχόντων περιέχει πρὸ]ς τοὺς Ἀμφικτίονας ἐπιστολή - - - - - - - -ΣΩ .
10 [. . . . . τῶ κοινῶ τῶν] Ἀμφικτιόνων χαίρειν. ἐκομισάμεθά τε
ἐπιστολὰ[ν] ἐν ᾗ [διεσα]-
[φήσατε ἁμῖν πάντα καὶ παρεκαλέσ]ατε τὰν ἁμετέρ[α]ν πόλιν κριτήριο[ν] φέρειν
[περὶ] Ἐρετριέω[ν] κα[ὶ]
[Καρυστίων ἀμφιλλεγόντων πάλιν πο]τὶ τὰν πόλιν τῶ[ν Χ]αλκιδέων π[ε]ρὶ τᾶς
κρίσιος τᾶ[ς γενομ]ένα[ς]
[ἀκολούθως τοῖς γεγραμμένοις] ὑπὸ τῶν ἱερομ[ναμ]ό[νω]ν τῶν συνελθόντων
εἰ[ς τὰν πυλα]ία[ν τὰν]
[- - - - ἐπὶ - - - - - ἄρχοντος ἐ]ν Δελφοῖς, πότ[ερον] κέκριται κατὰ [τὸ
βέ]λτιστ[ον ἢ δεῖ ἄκυ]-

[ρον τὴν κρίcιν γίγνεcθαι ἐν ἀν]δρά[c]ιν τριάκοντα ἑνὶ [κ]ληρωθ[εῖcιν] . ΞΑΓ
[- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - ὑπ]ὸ [τ]οῦ δάμου καὶ ὅτι λέγ[ουc]ι γενέcθαι τὰν κρίcιν [π]αρὰ [τ]ὰ [δόγ]-
[ματα - - - - - - - - - - - - - -] ἐν [Δ]ελφοῖc, τοῦ Ἡ[ρ]αίου μηνός, καθὼc [Δ]ελφοὶ ἄγοντ[ι . . . . .]
[- - - - - - - - - - - - - ἐν Ὑ]πάτα Φίλ[ιππ]ον τὸν ἀcτ[ρ]ολόγον ὃν ΕΛΕΚΕΤΕΟΥΠΑ . . . . . .
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -α τ[ο]ύτων καὶ κεχειροτο[νημ]ένους α[ὐτο]ὶ . . . ΛΡΙ
[- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - ἀ]πὸ δέκα δ[ύ]ο . . . . . ΕΝ . ΟΛΙΟΝΤ . . . Κ . Ν
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -ΤΙΣΦΑΓ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
[- - - - - - - - - - - - - γέ]γραπτα[ι τ]ῶι ΧΑ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -ΕΩΣΣ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -ΑΙ . ΥΣΑΣΙ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -Ρ- -
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -ΝΓΑΣΙΑΣΑΝ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -ΡΟΝΙΚΟΥΓΡΟΦΕΥ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -ΚΑΛΛΙΦΑΝΤΟΥ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -ΥΜΛ . . Σ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

1: [ἐκ τῶν ὑπομνημάτων or ὑπομνηματιcμῶν or ἐκ τῆc ἀναγραφῆc τῶν]: Wilhelm. || 2: [ἄρχοντοc· κρίματοc ἐν τῇ Ὑπάτῃ γεγονό]τοc: Pomtow. || 3: [τὸ δεύτερον πρὸc τὸ cυνέδριον παρα]γενομένων: Pomtow. ἀντιλεγόντων πάλιν: Pomtow. || 4: [ἑαυτοῖc πᾶcι τὴν κρίcιν]: Pomtow. [τήνδε τὴν κρίcιν]: Crönert, *SEG*. || 5: [ἐπιcτολὴν πρὸc Ὑπαταίουc]: Pomtow. || 5–6: κατὰ τὸ βέλ|[τιcτον πᾶcιν]: Pomtow. || 6–7: τῶν δὲ| [νέων δικαcτῶν]: Crönert, *SEG*. || 7–8: κρινάντων| [πλείονα]: Pomtow. || 8–9: ὑπὸ Ὑπα|[ταίων καὶ τῶν ἀρχόντων καὶ τῆc πόλεωc]: Pomtow. || 9–10: [Ὑπαταί]ων ο[ἱ ἄρχοντε]c| [καὶ ἁ πόλιc τῶι κοινῶι cυνεδρίωι τῶν Ἀμφικτιόνων χαίρειν: Pomtow. || 10–11: ἐν ἃ|[δ]ι̣ε̣|[caφήcατε τὰ γεγονότα]: Pomtow. || 11: κριτήριον δόμεν: Pomtow. || 11–12: καθ[ό]τι καὶ περὶ Καρυcτίων ἀμφιλλεγόντων]: Pomtow. || 12–13: τᾶc [γε]νομ[έναc| ὑφ' ἁμῶν]: Pomtow. || 13–14: εἰc τὰν ὀπ̣ω̣ρι̣ν̣ὰ̣[ν| πυλαίαν]: Pomtow. || 14–15: [πᾶcιν ὑφ' ἁμῶν| ἢ δεῖ ἄκυρον γίγνεcθαι τὰν κρίcιν]: Pomtow. || 15: [κ]ληρωθ[εῖcιν, ἐ]ξ ἁπ[άντων]: Daux. || 15–16: κληρωθεῖcιν, [ὅ]τι ἀναί[νο]ν[ται Ἐρετριεῖc καὶ| Καρύcτιοι τὰν κρίcιν τὰν γεγονεῖαν]: Pomtow. || 16–17: [τὰ δόγματα| τῶν ἱερομναμόνων]: Pomtow. || 17: καθὼc [κ]αὶ ἁ ἀποπε̣[μφθεῖca]: Pomtow.

B: Column II of *FDelphes* III.1.578 + inventory fragment 6384

Θ [ε ὸ] c τ [ύ χ α ν ἀ γ α θ] ά ν

ἀναγ[ραφὴ τῆc γ]ενομένηc κρ[ίcεωc τοῦ ἐπὶ . . 7–10 . . ἄρχοντοc ἐν Δελφοῖc ἐ]νιαυτοῦ πρὸc τοὺc Ε[ὐβοιέαc]·

ἄλλω[ν] αἱρεθέντων ἐν Εὐβοίαι [πρεcβευτῶν, παρὰ μὲν Ἐρετριέων καὶ Καρυcτίων Ε]ὐνίκου τοῦ Διονυcοδώρο[υ],

Εὐ̣[. . 6–7 . . τοῦ] Φιλίσκου, γενομέ[νου δὲ παρὰ Χαλκιδέων . . . 10–12 . . . τοῦ Καλ]λικράτου, περὶ τῆς ἱερο-
μ[νημοσύνη]ς τοῦ κατὰ Πύθια ἱ[ερομνήμονος, καὶ τῶμ μὲν Χαλκιδέων φαμέ-
νων τ]ὴν μὲν ψῆφον εἶναι κοινὴ̣[ν]
π[άντω]ν̣ Εὐβοιέων, ἑαυτοῖς [δὲ τὴν ἀεὶ? κατὰ Πύθια ὑπάρχειν ἱερομνημο-
σύνην, τ]ῶν δὲ παρὰ τῆς Ἐρετρ[ι]-
[έων πό]λεως πρεσβευτῶν κ̣α̣[ὶ παρὰ Καρυστίων ἀντιλεγόντων πᾶσιν, καὶ οὐ
φαμένων] κοινὴν εἶναι τὴν ψῆ-
[φο]ν̣ πάντ[ω]ν Εὐβοιέων καὶ δεῖ̣ν̣ [τὸν ἱερομνήμονα καθίστασθαι τοῖς δόγμασιν
ἀκολούθω]ς, καὶ τῶν Ἀμφι-
κ[τ]ιόνων δόντων κριτήριον τ[οῖς ἄρχουσιν καὶ τῆι πόλει Ὑπαταίων, ὥστε
ἐπιμεληθή]ς̣εσθαι τῆς κρίς[εως]
ἐν ἀνδράσιν τριάκοντα ἐνὶ [ἀριστίνδην? χειροτονηθεῖσι, καὶ τούτων μὲν
αἱρεθέντων, ὁ]ρισάντ[ω]ν δ[ὲ]
[κα]ὶ τὸν χρόνον ἐν ὧι [ἔ]στ[αι ἡ κρίσις περὶ ὧν οἱ Ἀμφικτίονες ἔγραψαν?,
ἑκάτεροι συνε]ῖπον καὶ [συν]-
[ε]φώνησαν τοῖς Ἀμ[φ]ικτ[ίοσι].

Ἐ̣[πιστολὴ Ὑπαταί]ω̣ν̣

Ὑπαταίω[ν] οἱ ἄρχοντ[ες τῶι κοινῶι τῶν Ἀμφικτιόνων χαίρειν· ἐπειδὴ αὖθις
μὲν? ἐπετάξ]α̣τε ἁμῖν [δε]-
δωκέναι κριτήριον τ[αῖς ἐν Εὐβοίαι πόλεσι, παραγενόμενοι δὲ πρεσβευτὰι
παρεκάλε?]ον τὰν [ἁμε]-
τέραν πόλιν περὶ τᾶς [ἱερομναμοσύνας τοῦ κατὰ Πύθια ἱερομνάμονος, καὶ τᾶς
μὲ]ν πόλ[ιος τῶν]
[Χ]αλκιδέων φαμέν[ας -]

2: ἀναγ[ραφείσης]: Bourguet. κρ[ίσεως περὶ τῆς ἱερομνημοσύνης τοῦ κατὰ Πύθια ἑ]νιαυτοῦ: Robert. || 4: Εὐ- or Εχ-: Bousquet. || The remaining few lines (18–25) of *FDelphes* III.1.578 are extremely fragmented and offer little beyond a reference to a date and to the hieromnemonic vote.

The right to representation among the Amphiktyonic hieromnemones was frequently the subject of an arbitration.[1] Such disputes normally opposed members of the same ethnic group. Lokrian Skarphai and Thronion disputed the arrangements for distribution of the Epiknemidian Lokrian vote (**133, 167**), as did the Dorians of Doris and of Sparta (**139**). In the present case, the *ethnos* involved was the Euboians, and here, as in other instances, the arbitration between the disputing parties was referred by the Amphiktyony to a state outside the ethnic group. The inscriptions cited above contain a number of separate documents relating to a quarrel within the Euboian *koinon* over the Amphiktyonic vote.[2] The Euboian disputants were Chalkis on the one side, and Eretria and

1. See **23, 133, 139, 167**. See Daux, *Delphes*, pp. 329f.

2. Bourguet, the original editor of *FDelphes* III.1.260 (and 261), at first thought there might be some connection with these inscriptions. However, *FDelphes* III.1.260 merely seems to be

Karystos on the other. It seems more than likely that Eretria and Karystos found themselves on the same side not so much because of mutual sympathies and common interests as because they both opposed Chalkis's pretensions. The specific issue, as was made clear by the discovery of the new fragment in 1938, was not the right to appoint the Euboian hieromnemon in itself; rather it was the right to appoint the hieromnemon during a Pythian year.[3] Chalkis evidently argued that the general rule was for the right of appointment to be common to all the Euboian states, except during a Pythian year, when it was Chalkis's alone. Eretria and Karystos at least objected to Chalkis's claims and turned to the Amphiktyony to settle the matter.

The Amphiktyony passed the quarrel along to a neutral state for judgement. Ainian Hypata was requested to form a tribunal, and did so, of thirty-one men chosen by lot, perhaps from the *demos* at large. But this common procedure proved to be unsatisfactory when the Hypatan judges found in favour of Chalkis. The Eretrians and Karystians appealed the Hypatan decision to the Amphiktyony and called its regularity into question. The Hypatans obligingly formed a second tribunal, also of thirty-one men, but this time chosen on a more elitist basis: [χειρο]τονηθέντων ἀριστίνδην (A, line 7). This second court, which published its findings during the Delphic archonship of Babylos, was also persuaded by Chalkis's arguments.[4] This would have been a great disappointment to the Eretrians and Karystians, who were clearly prepared to blame the original judgement on a lack of expertise demonstrated by a popular court. The double judgement of the Hypatans is an interesting illustration of the drawbacks and advantages the Greeks evidently associated with the different types of tribunals.

167. Arbitrations between Skarphai and Thronion over boundaries and the Amphiktyonic vote (c. 110)

A series of documents from Delphi dealing with points of conflict between the Lokrian communities of Thronion and Skarphai in the latter part of the second century. See *FDelphes* III.4.38–42 for the epigraphic details.

---

an honorary decree for three judges from Hypata; it is unnecessary to see any link (*SEG* II.275; Pomtow, *Klio* 18 [1923] p. 277, XXIX, no. 206a; Tod 24; cf. **14** Appendix); see Bousquet, p. 116 n. 4.

3. See Bousquet, p. 117.

4. Daux places the archonship of Babylos between 120 and 108. He also believes (from the mention of "Philip the astrologer," an individual who may have played some role in the arbitration and who appears both in this dossier and in that cited in **167**) that the Euboian and the Epiknemidian Lokrian arbitrations were contemporaneous.

Karystos on the other. It seems more than likely that Eretria and Karystos found themselves on the same side not so much because of mutual sympathies and common interests as because they both opposed Chalkis's pretensions. The specific issue, as was made clear by the discovery of the new fragment in 1938, was not the right to appoint the Euboian hieromnemon in itself; rather it was the right to appoint the hieromnemon during a Pythian year.[3] Chalkis evidently argued that the general rule was for the right of appointment to be common to all the Euboian states, except during a Pythian year, when it was Chalkis's alone. Eretria and Karystos at least objected to Chalkis's claims and turned to the Amphiktyony to settle the matter.

The Amphiktyony passed the quarrel along to a neutral state for judgement. Ainian Hypata was requested to form a tribunal, and did so, of thirty-one men chosen by lot, perhaps from the *demos* at large. But this common procedure proved to be unsatisfactory when the Hypatan judges found in favour of Chalkis. The Eretrians and Karystians appealed the Hypatan decision to the Amphiktyony and called its regularity into question. The Hypatans obligingly formed a second tribunal, also of thirty-one men, but this time chosen on a more elitist basis: [χειρο]τονηθέντων ἀριστίνδην (A, line 7). This second court, which published its findings during the Delphic archonship of Babylos, was also persuaded by Chalkis's arguments.[4] This would have been a great disappointment to the Eretrians and Karystians, who were clearly prepared to blame the original judgement on a lack of expertise demonstrated by a popular court. The double judgement of the Hypatans is an interesting illustration of the drawbacks and advantages the Greeks evidently associated with the different types of tribunals.

167. Arbitrations between Skarphai and Thronion over boundaries and the Amphiktyonic vote (c. 110)

A series of documents from Delphi dealing with points of conflict between the Lokrian communities of Thronion and Skarphai in the latter part of the second century. See *FDelphes* III.4.38–42 for the epigraphic details.

---

an honorary decree for three judges from Hypata; it is unnecessary to see any link (*SEG* II.275; Pomtow, *Klio* 18 [1923] p. 277, XXIX, no. 206a; Tod 24; cf. **14** Appendix); see Bousquet, p. 116 n. 4.

3. See Bousquet, p. 117.

4. Daux places the archonship of Babylos between 120 and 108. He also believes (from the mention of "Philip the astrologer," an individual who may have played some role in the arbitration and who appears both in this dossier and in that cited in **167**) that the Euboian and the Epiknemidian Lokrian arbitrations were contemporaneous.

I: Arbitration over the Amphiktyonic vote.

H. Pomtow, *Klio* 16 (1919) pp. 160f., no. 130; *Colin, *FDelphes* III.4.1.38.

II: Fragment.

H. Pomtow, *Klio* 16 (1919) pp. 160f., no. 130; *Colin, *FDelphes* III.4.1.39.

III: Fragment.

H. Pomtow, *Klio* 16 (1919) pp. 160f., no. 130; *Colin, *FDelphes* III.4.1.40.

IV: Fragment.

*Colin, *FDelphes* III.4.1.41.

V: Boundary settlement.

H. Pomtow, *Klio* 16 (1919) pp. 160f., no. 131; *Colin, *FDelphes* III.4.1.42.

A further fragment, published by Y. Béquignon (*Recherches archéologiques à Pheres* [Paris, 1937] p. 79, no. 2), may be related.

H. Pomtow, *Klio* 16 (1919) pp. 146, 160f.; A. Wilhelm, *AAWW* 59 (1922) p. 24; H. Pomtow, *Klio* 18 (1923) pp. 265f., nos. IX, X; *SEG* II.335, 336, 392; G. Klaffenbach, *Klio* 20 (1925) pp. 66–88; Daux, *Delphes,* pp. 335–41; R. Bonner/G. Smith, *CPh* 38 (1943) p. 12; Lerat, pp. 105–6.

I: Arbitral judgement on the hieromnemonic representation

[Κριτὰς ἀκηκόατε ὅτι ἐγέ]νοντο σύμφωνοι πρὸς ἀλλήλους, καὶ νενικηκότα[ς]
[τοὺς Θρονιέας κ]αὶ ε[ἰλ]ηφότας ψήφους πεντήκοντα ἐννέα, τοὺς δὲ Cκ[αρ]-
[φέας εἰληφότ]ας ψήφους [δ]ύο. [γ]εγράφαμεν οὖν ὑμῖν, ἵνα εἰδῆτε· ὑπογ[έ]-
[γραπται δὲ] ὑμῖν καὶ τὸ ἀντίγραφον τῆς ἀντιγραφῆς τῆς ἀποδοθείση[ς]
[ἡμῖν ὑπὸ τῶ]ν ἐξαποσταλέντων πρεσβευτῶν παρὰ τῆς πόλεως τῆς Θρο-
[νιέων, ὁμο]ίως δὲ καὶ τῆς δοθείσης ἀντιγραφῆς ὑπὸ τῶν ἐξαποσταλέντω[ν]
[πρεσβευτ]ῶν παρὰ τῆς πόλεως τῆς Cκαρφέων. ᵛ ἀμφιλλέγει ἁ πόλις τῶν Θρονιέω[ν]
[περὶ τᾶς ἰε]ρομναμοσύνας ποτὶ τὰν πόλιν τῶν Cκαρφέων· "ἐπιβάλλει μοι τᾶς τῶ[ν]
[Ἐπικν]αμι(δ)ίων Λοκρῶν ἀμφικτιονείας τὸ τρίτον μέρος, καθάπερ καὶ τὰ πρόβατα ἐ[ν]
[τὰς θυ]σίας καὶ τὰ ἄλλα τὰ νομιζόμενα πρότερον ἐν τοὺς Ἀμφικτίονας συ[μ]-
[βέβλ]ημαι, καὶ καθ' ὃ κέκριμαι πρότερον περὶ τούτων ἐν Ἀμφίσσαι κατὰ τὸ[ν]
[ἀμ]φικτιονικὸν νόμον· καὶ δεῖ κρατεῖν ἐμὲ καὶ κυριεύειν τοῦ ἐμῖν ἐπιβά[λ]-
[λ]οντος μέρεος, καὶ τὸν ἱερομνάμονα καθίστασθαι παρ' ἐμὲ καὶ πέμπε-
σθαι ὑπ' ἐμοῦ, ἐπεί κα ἐμὶν καθήκῃ ἁ ἱερομναμοσύνα. τὺ δέ, πόλι Cκαρφέ-
ων, ἀντιποιεῖσαι κακοπραγμόνως κατασοφιζομένα, καὶ ἐξιδιάζεσθα[ι θέ]-
λεις ἀδίκως τὸ ἐμὶν ἐπιβάλλον μέρος τᾶς ἱερομναμοσύνας." ᵛ ἁ πόλις τῶ[ν]
C[κ]αρφέων ἀντ[ε]γ[ρ]άψατο ποτὶ τὰν πόλιν τῶν Θρονιέω[ν]· "μὴ δεῖν εἶμεν τὸ τρί[τον]

μέρος τᾶς ἱερομναμοσύνας Θρονιέων, ἀλλ' εἶμεν κοινὰν τὰν ἱερομναμοσύν[αν] Λοκρῶν τῶν [Ἐ]πικναμιδίων κατά τε τὰ πάτρια καὶ τὰς γεγονείας περὶ το[ύ]-
20 των κρίσεις παρά τε τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις καὶ Ἀμφικτίοσιν, καὶ δεῖν τὸν ἱερομνά[μο]-να καθίστασθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν Λοκρῶν ἀκολούθως τοῖς ἀπὸ τ[ᾶ]ς ἀρχ[ᾶς] διωικημένοις καὶ τῶ[ι ὑ]πὸ Ῥωμαίων κειμένωι γραπτῶι."

1: [ἐνὶ - - ἐννέα καὶ πεντήκ]οντα σύμφωνοι: Pomtow. || 2: [Θρονιέας εἶν]αι: Pomtow. || 2–3: Ϙκα[ρ|φέας εἰληφέναι]: Pomtow. || 3–4: ὑποτε̣|[τάχαμεν δὲ] ὑμῖν: Pomtow. ὑπογέ|[γραπται] or ὑπογε|[γράφαμεν]?: Colin. || 6: [ὡσαύ]τως: Pomtow. || 8: ἐπιβάλλοι: Pomtow. || 9 (beginning): the stone reads ΑΜΙΛΙΩΝ. Ἀμφικτυονείας: Pomtow. || 12: [Ἀμ]φικτυονικὸν: Pomtow. || 20: δεῖμ: Pomtow.

II: Fragment (*FDelphes* III.4.1.39)

- -
[- -ο̣]ς τε . . . ας- - - - - - - - - -
[- - - - - - - - ἡιρ]ῆσθαι ὑφ' ὑμ[ῶν τὴν ἡμετέ]ραν πόλιν ἵνα Θ[ρονι? - - - - - -]
- - - - - - - - - - - κριτήριον ἀν[δρῶν . . . ακ]οσίων καὶ ἑνὸ[ς - - - - - - - - - -]
[- - - - - - - κα]τὰ Φίλιππον ας[. . . . . κ]αὶ εὐαρεστηκό[τ- - - - - - - - - - - -]
5 [- - - - - περ]ὶ τῆ[ς] ἱερομνημ[οσύνης ἀ]ντιλέγουσιν π[ρὸς ἀλλήλ- - - - - - -]
[- - - - - - τ]ῶν Θρονιέων καὶ [Σκαρφ]έων εἰς τὴν προ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
[- - - - - - - ϲε̣]ων αὐτῶν συμ[φώνων] ὄντων ἡμῖν [χ]ει[ρίζειν - - - - - - - - -]
[- - - - - χ]ρίτηριον καὶ κριθῆ[ναι Με]ταγειτνιῶνος - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -ε
- - - - - - -ου μέχρι τρίτης ε . . . . . αν τούτων παρα- - - - - - - - - -ων [ἐν] ἡμέ-
10 [ραις . . . . . τὸ]ν ἡμέτερον δῆμο[ν . . . . .] αὐτοῖς τὸ κρίτ[ηριον] καὶ [χ]εκριμέ-
[νον . . . . . μη]νὶ Μεταγειτνιῶ[νι . . . . ἐ]πὶ δέκα ἐν ἀν[δράς]ιν ἑξήκοντα
[καὶ ἑνί].

2: ὑφ' Ὑπ[οκνημιδίων] Ὑάνπολιν: Pomtow. || 2–3: [ἡιρ]ῆσθαι ὑφ' ὑμῶ[ν τὴν ἡμετέρ]αν πόλιν, ἵνα Θ[ρονιεῦσιν καὶ Σκαρ|φεῦσιν δῶμε]ν κριτήριον ἀνδ[ρῶν τρια]χοσίων καὶ ἑνό[ς, οἵτινες κτλ]: Klaffenbach. || 3: ἀνδ̣[ρῶν τρια?]χοσίων: Pomtow. || 4: Φίλιππον ἃς: Pomtow. Φίλιππον ἀς[τρολόγον]: Daux. εὐαρεστηκό[τας]: Pomtow. || 5–6: πρ[ὸς ἀλλήλους| αἱ πόλεις] τῶν Θρονιέων: Pomtow. || 7: [τῶν πρεσβευ]τῶν αὐτῶν: Pomtow. || 7–8: χει[ρίζεσθαι τὸ περὶ| τούτων] κριτήριον: Pomtow. || 9: τρίτης ἐπ[ὶ δέκα]: Pomtow. παρα[γενομένων]: Pomtow. || 11: [τρίτηι?] ἐπὶ δέκα: Pomtow.

III: Fragment (*FDelphes* III.4.1.40)

[ἄρχο]ντο[ς - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
. . . ρειου τ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
. . . . νοι πα- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
[. . κρ]ιταὶ Ἀλ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
5 [. . . ο]υ, Καλλ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
. . . αμος Κ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

[. . Δ]ωροθε[ο- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
. . . ου, Χαρι- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
[. . . κ]ρατης - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
[. . . Δ]ωροθ[εο- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
. . . . υ, Κλ[ε- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
. . . . . ς Χα- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

IV: Fragment (*FDelphes* III.4.1.41)

- - - -ΕΙ . . . . ΕΙΝΑΡ . . . . ΑΠΟΣ- - - - - - - - - -
- - - - -ΟΙΘΡΟΝΙΕΙΣΙΕΡΟΜΝΗΜ- - - - - - - - - -
- - -ΘΙΑΔΑΚΑΙΠΕΡΙΤΟΥΤΩΝΑΥ- - - - - - - - - -
- - -ΣΤΕΙΥΠΕΡΕΘΕΝ . ΟΑ- - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - - -ΘΡΟΝΙ . . ΝΑ . . . . . ΟΣΕΠΙΒΑΛ- - - - - - - - -
- - - -ΚΑΝΓΕΓΕΝΗΣΘ . . . ΝΑΜΦΙΣΒΗΤ- - - - - - -
- - - -Υ . . ΤΟΜΕΓΙ . . . . . ΛΕ- - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - -ΤΩΝ- - - - - - - - - -ΟΙ- - - - - - -
- - - - - - - -ΣΥ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - -Ε . . ΑΚΟΥΣΑΝΤΑΣΑΥΤΩΝ- - - - - - - - -
- - - - - -ΤΗΝΔΕΙΕΡΟΜΝΗΜΟΣΥΝ- - - - - - - - -
- - - - - -ΕΣ . . ΛΕΙΝΤΟΝΙΕΡΟΜΝΗ- - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - -ΑΜΦΙΣ- - - - - - - - - - - - -

vacat

The following words or names (or related ones) are fairly certain (Colin): Θρονιεῖς (lines 2, 5); ἱερομνήμων, ἱερομνημοσύνη (lines 2, 11, 12); ἐπιβάλλειν (line 5); ἀμφισβήτησις (line 6); Ἄμφισσα (line 13).

V: Boundary settlement between Thronion and Skarphai

[Ἀ]γα[θ]ᾶι τύ[χαι. ἀρχόντων ἐν Θρονίωι - - - -]κλέος, Μνασιμάχου, μηνὸς ⟨Ἀ⟩φαμίου,
[ἐ]ν [δ]ὲ Σκαρφ[είαι ἀρχόντων - - - , - - -]ξένου, μηνὸς Ἰτωνίου τεσσαρεσκαιδεκά-
[τ]αι, ὁ[μό]λογον ἐθελούσι[ον ἦν πόλει Σκαρφέ]ων καὶ πόλει Θρονιέων, ὃ συνέθεντο ὑπὲρ μὲν
τὰν πόλιν τῶν Σκαρφέω[ν οἵ τε ἄρχοντες κ]αὶ οἱ πρόβουλοι καὶ οἱ σύνεδροι, ὑπὲρ δὲ τὰν πό-
λιν τῶν Θρονιέων οἵ τε ἄ[ρχοντες καὶ οἱ σύ]νεδροι, ὥστε τᾶς χώρας τᾶς καλειμένας Χοννείας,
[π]ερὶ ἃς διεφέροντο ποτ' ἀλ[λήλας α]ἱ πό[λε]ις καὶ ἐπρέσβευσαν ἐπὶ σύγκλητον, εἶ⟨μ⟩εν αὐτοῖς
ὅρους τοὺς ὑπογεγραμμ[ένους]. [v] ἕνα μὲν κίονα, ὃν ἔθηκαν κοινᾶι παρά τε τὸν ποταμὸν τὸν
Ἀφάμιον καὶ παρὰ τὰν ὁδὸ[ν τὰ]ν δοχμά⟨δ⟩α, ἃι γειτονεῖ ἐκ τοῦ ποτὶ μέσον ἁμέρας τὸ πρότε-

ρον μὲν Μαχάτα, νῦν δὲ Εὐφ[ράνο]ρος τοῦ Χαιριγένεος Θρονιέος χωρίον, τιθεμένου τοῦ ὅρου ἐ-
[πὶ] τοῦ ποτ' ἄρκτον μέρεος τ[ᾶς ὁδ]οῦ καὶ τοῦ προγεγραμμένου χωρίου. καὶ ἄλλον ἀπὸ τούτου τοῦ
ὅρου παρὰ τὰν ὁδὸν τὰν δ[οχμά]δα παρὰ τὸ προγεγραμμένον χωρίον, ἀπέχοντα ἀπὸ τοῦ
πρώτου ὅρου ἐν τὸ ποτ' ἀ[ὼ μέρ]ος δεκάπεδα δωρικὰ ἐνενήκοντα καὶ ἑπτά, πόδας ἕξ, ἀπέ-
χοντα δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ τᾶς λεγο[μέν]ας ὁδοῦ παρὰ τὰ ἄρσια, μετρειμένου ἐν τὸ ποθ' ἑσπέραν
μέρος παρὰ τὰν ὁδὸν τὰν δ[οχμ]άδα, ὡς παρήκει τὸ Καμώνδα [τ]οῦ Ζωΐλου Θρονιέος χωρί-
ον καὶ τὸ Εὐφράνορος χωρί[ον], δεκάπεδα δωρικὰ διακόσια τέσσαρα, πόδας τέσσαρας. καὶ ἀπὸ τού-
[το]υ το[ῦ] κίονος ἄλλον ἐν τ[ὸ πο]τ' ἄρκτον μέρος παρὰ θαλάσσαι, ἀπέχοντα ἀπὸ τοῦ πο-
[τάμου] Ἀφαμίου ἐν τὸ ποτ' ἀ[νατο]λὰν μέρος δεκάπεδα δωρ[ικ]ὰ διακόσια εἴκοσι τρία, πόδας
[πέν]τε, τοῦ ποτάμου ἀπέ[χοντος ἀ]πὸ τοῦ Λύκωνος πύργου ἀ[πὸ τ]οῦ τοίχου τοῦ ἐν ⟨τὸ⟩ ποτ' ἀνατο-
[λὰν μέρος δε]κάπεδα δ[ωρικὰ π]εντήκοντα σὺν τῶι ἔρκει τῶι ἐν τὸ πο[θ'] ἑσπέρα⟨ν⟩ μέρος,
[καὶ] τοῦ ποτάμου ἔχον[τος αὐτ]οῦ πλάτος πόδας πεντήκοντα σὺν τῶι ἔρκει τῶι ἐν
[τὸ π]οτ' ἀνατολὰν μέρο[ς, τῶν δὲ] μέτρων τιθεμένων ἀπὸ μὲν τοῦ πύργου ἐν ὀρθὸν ἐπὶ
[τὸ]ν πόταμον παρὰ τὰς [ἀτραπ]οὺς καὶ παρὰ τὰν σκάπετον, ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ ποτάμου πο-
[τὶ τ- - - - - - - - -]α ἐν τὸ κ[άτω] μέρος ποτὶ θάλασσαν, καὶ πάλιν ἀ[πέ]χοντος τοῦ αὐτοῦ
[κίο]νος ἐκ τ[ο]ῦ ποτ' ἀνατ[ολὰν μ]έρεος ἀπὸ θαλάσσας κατὰ τὰν σκάπετον τὰν παρὰ [τὸ]
- - - - - - - -ον ἐν τὸ π[οθ' ἑσπέ]ραν μέρος δεκάπεδα δ[ωρι]κὰ διακόσια τριάκοντα
[ἕξ], πόδας τρεῖ[ς], ἀπέχοντ[ος τοῦ αὐ]τοῦ μέτρου ἐκ τοῦ πα[ρὰ θά]λασσαν μέρεος. καὶ ἄλ-
[λον - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - ἀ]π' εὐθ⟨ε⟩ίας ἀπὸ τοῦ παρὰ θάλασσαν ὅρου ἐν τὸν
[πα]ρὰ τὰν ὁδὸν τὰν δοχμ[άδα, καὶ ἀ]πέχοντα ἀπὸ τοῦ ὅρου τοῦ παρὰ τὸν Ἀφάμιον δεκά-
[π]εδα ἐνεν[ήκ]οντα [ἑ]πτὰ [πόδας - - -· ἀ]πέχει δὲ καὶ ὁ πόταμος ὁ Ἀφάμιος ἀ[π]ὸ τᾶς Καλλι⟨δ⟩ά-
[μ]ου τοῦ [Ἀπολλοδώρ]ου Σκαρφέ[ος οἰκίας ἀ]πὸ τοῦ τοίχο⟨υ⟩ τοῦ ἐν τὸ ποτ' ἀνατολάγ μέρος σὺν
[τ]ῶι ἔρκει τῶι ἐν τὸ ποτὶ Σκά[ρφειαν μ]έρος πόδας δωρικοὺς ἑξήκοντα, ἔχοντος τοῦ

[πο]τάμου κατὰ τὸ ὑποκάτω μ[έρος τᾶ]ς ὁδοῦ τᾶς δοχμά[δ]ος πλάτος πόδας πεντήκον-
[τα] σὺν τῶι [ἔρ]κει τῶι ἐν τὸ πο[τ' ἀνατο]λὰν μέρος. ᵛ μὴ ἀντιποιήσασθω δὲ τᾶς χώρας μηδε-
[τέ]ρα πόλις, ὑπερβᾶσα τοὺς πρ[ογεγρα]μμένους ὅρους, μηδὲ καθ' ὁποῖον τρόπον μηδὲν
35 [σιν]έτω τοὺς προγεγραμμέ[νους ὅρο]υς, μηδὲ δικαξάζθω μηδετέρα πόλις ἐκ ταύτας
[τᾶς] χώ[ρας ἐγ] μηθενὸς ἐγκλ[ήματο]ς ἐκ τοῦ πρότερον χρόνου κατὰ μηθένα τρόπον· εἰ δὲ
[μή], ἀποτεισάτω ἁ παραβαίν[ουσά] τι πόλις τῶν ἐν τῶι ὁμολόγωι γεγραμμένων ἀργυρί-
ου τάλαντα ἑξήκοντα. καὶ [ὁμοίω]ς ἃ τε ὀροθεσία κυρία ἔστω κατὰ ἑκατέραν τᾶν πολίων
[ἰ]δίᾳ χώραι καθότι προγέγρ[απτα]ι· τὸ δὲ ὁμόλογον τόδε κύριον ἔστω ἐν πάντα τὸν χρόνον.

1: the stone reads ΦΑΜΙΟΥ or ΦΑΛΙΟΥ. [τῶν μὲν Θρονιέων ἄρ]χοντος Μελ[αντί]χου: Pomtow. || 2: [τῶν δ]ὲ Σκαρφέ[ων ἄρχοντος Ἀριστο?]ξένου: Pomtow. || 3: ἐθέλουσι[ν]: Pomtow. || 6: ἐπρέσβευον: Pomtow. εἴ⟨μ⟩εν: Colin; the stone reads EINEN. || 7: κατ τὸν κίονα: Pomtow. || 8: the stone reads ΔΟΧΜΑΛΑ. [τ]αν δοχμάν, τᾶι γειτονεῖ: Pomtow. ἁμέρας ⟨μέρεος⟩: Pomtow. || 9: Εὔφ[ρο]γος: Pomtow. || 9–10: ἐχ|{χ}τοῦ: Pomtow. || 11: [ξενί]δα: Pomtow. || 13: τὰ Ἄρεια: Pomtow. || 14: [ξενί]δα: Pomtow. || 15: Τυ[χ]άνορος: Pomtow. || 16: πρώτου κίονος: Pomtow. παρὰ θάλασσαν: Pomtow. || 16–17: ἀπέχοντα ἀπὸ τοῦ τοι[χ]ό[χ|του] τοῦ Μάνου: Pomtow. ἀπέχοντα ἀπὸ τοῦ τοί[χ]ο[υ| τοῦ] τοῦ Μάνου: Wilhelm. || 17–18: πόδας| [ἕξ, καὶ] ἐκ: Pomtow. || 18: ἀπέ[χοντα ἀ]πὸ: Pomtow. ἵν ποτ': Pomtow. The stone reads ΤΟΥΕΝΙΙΟΤ. || 19: the stone reads ΕΣΠΕΡΑΥ. || 20: [ἀπὸ] τοῦ ποταμοῦ: Pomtow. [τ]οῦ πλάτος: Pomtow. || 21: [τῶν] μέτρων: Pomtow. ἐν ὀρθὸν ἐν: Pomtow. || 22–23: τοῦ ποτ' ἄρχτον| [κίονος ἄλλ]ον κίονα ἐν τὸ κά[τω] μέρος: Pomtow. || 24: [. . . . κίονος?] ἀπὸ τοῦ: Pomtow. || 24–25: παρὰ τὸ[ν| Ἀφάμιον ποταμ]όν: Pomtow. || 26: [δύο?]. . πόδας τρε[ῖς, μ]έσον τ[ιθεμένου] τοῦ μέτρου ἐκ: Pomtow. || 26–27: καὶ ἄλ|[λο]υ[ς κ]ίονας ἀνὰ μέσον . . . . . πευοσίας: Pomtow. The stone reads ΙΙΕΥΘΣΙΑΣ. || 28: δοχμ[άν]: Pomtow. || 29: δ[ωρικὰ ἐξ]ήκοντα: Pomtow. καλ[ιᾶς]: Pomtow. || 29–30: Καλλις⟨τρ⟩ά|[τ]ου or Καλλι⟨δ⟩ά|[μ]ου: Colin; the stone reads ΚΑΛΛΙΣΑ. || 30: τοῦ τοιχόχτου: Pomtow; the stone reads ΤΟΙΧΟΧΤΟΥ. || 32: δοχμᾶς ὁ σπάρτος: Pomtow. || 33: μηδέ τι ποιησάσθω: Pomtow. || 33–34: μηδὲ [κ]α|[θελ]έτω: Wilhelm. || 34–35: μηδένα| [φερ]έτω: Pomtow. || 35: δικαξάσθω: Pomtow. || 38: καὶ οὕ[τω]ς: Pomtow. || 39: [κ]αὶ ἁ χώρα: Pomtow.

This dossier of documents dealing with the relations between the Epiknemidian Lokrian towns of Skarphai and Thronion was engraved on the base of the monument of Paullus Aemilius at Delphi. The first group (I–IV) deals with an arbitration between the two little states over the right to appoint the

Epiknemidian hieromnemonic representative; the second document (V) is a boundary settlement between them. Both the Amphiktyonic connection and the boundary dispute made these suitable documents for inscription at the sanctuary of Delphi. The similar style and identical venue of the inscriptions suggest that all of Thronion and Skarphai's differences were settled around the same time. The date of these events is probably the same as that of the arbitration between the Euboian states over their Amphiktyonic rights, somewhere around 110 B.C.[1] The arguments advanced by both sides tell us that there had been previous judgements affecting the Amphiktyonic dispute between the two towns, though there is little indication of the dates of the earlier arbitration or arbitrations. It has been suggested elsewhere (**133**) that they may go back as early as the 160s, although it is possible that a much smaller time gap separates them from the present case. The identity of the earlier arbitrators is, however, quite clear. The Thronians point out that they had in the past received a favourable judgement from the Amphissans in west Lokris; the Skarphaians, on the other hand, had had their rights upheld by the Athenians and by the Amphiktyony itself. Furthermore, the Skarphaians argued that their claims were in accordance with a decision of the Romans.

The first document is apparently a communication from the arbitrators of c. 110 to the Delphic Amphiktyony, with the intent of informing them of their decision on the matter of the hieromnemonic vote. Colin believed that the arbitrating state might have been Athens, based on the employment of the Attic dialect in the opening lines. The fact that the Athenians had participated in a judgement between Thronion and Skarphai at some earlier date would have made them a natural choice for the present arbitration. Like many other inscriptions recording an arbitration, this document includes a summary of the basic arguments of both sides. It is most unusual, however, in the style and nature of this summary. We have what appears to be a stylized denunciation (in the first person) of Skarphai by Thronion.[2] Thronion makes a bitter summary of its own case, an attack on Skarphai, accusing Skarphai of sophistic wrongdoing: "But you, city of Skarphai, you quibble in evil fashion with specious lies, and you wish to appropriate for yourself unjustly my fair share of the hieromnemonic vote." By contrast, the Skarphaian summary is quite restrained and diplomatic. It is not as direct or personal an attack, merely a statement of the Skarphaian

1. See **166**; the same individual, "Philip the astrologer," is referred to in both cases. On the date, see Daux, *Delphes*, pp. 340–41.

2. Elsewhere we can find the verbatim first-person testimony of individual witnesses, recorded at length (**70**); but this is a unique style for the arguments of the litigants. Colin (*FDelphes* III.4.1, p. 58 n. 4) cites Hiller von Gaertringen's comparison of *IG* V.2.443–45 (**168**) and the first-person style of some of those fragments; there, however, it is difficult to say whether the first-person narrative records the testimony of individual witnesses or litigants, or the claims of the state as a whole.

position on this matter. The unique character of the summary suggests that the inscription reflects the actual submissions made by the two adversaries to the arbitrating state.

The Thronians argued that they were owed a third share in the hieromnemonic representation of the Epiknemidian Lokrians to the Delphic Amphiktyony. They based this on the proportion of their contributions to sacrifices and other Amphiktyonic practices and argued that this position had been upheld in the past by the Amphissans, in accordance with Amphiktyonic law. Skarphai, on the other hand, maintained that the vote was common to all the Epiknemidian Lokrians, and that no one had a monopoly on it, even of a third. This would be in keeping with ancestral custom, with the judgements handed down by the Athenians in the past and by the Amphiktyones as well. The Epiknemidian hieromnemon should be chosen by the Lokrian *koinon* as a whole, the way it was in the beginning, and the way approved by the Romans. In spite of the extensive arguments brought to bear by the Skarphaians and their references to the Amphiktyony, the Romans, and the Athenians themselves, the present court found overwhelmingly (fifty-nine to two) for the Thronians and their claims on partitioning the hieromnemonic representation.

Documents II–IV, although fragmented, are clearly connected to the process of arbitration between Thronion and Skarphai. The second may be the Athenian summary of the procedures they followed in carrying out the arbitration: the choice of the court of sixty-one men, the nature of the dispute between Thronion and Skarphai, the agreement between the two to hand the matter over to Athens, and the date (the month Metageitnion) set for the judgement.[3] The third may be a list of the Athenian judges; the fourth offers nothing in the way of continuous sense, but it is clearly connected.

The final document in the dossier is much more complete, and generally straightforward. It records the new boundaries drawn between Thronion and Skarphai and the settlement of their land dispute. A territory known as Chonneia was contested by the two, hotly enough for them to send embassies to the Roman senate about the matter (lines 5–6). There is no further mention of the Romans, a circumstance that might lead us to think that they had referred the case back to Greece in their typical manner. But the boundary delineation between Thronion and Skarphai is referred to as a ὁ[μό]λογον ἐθελούσι[ον] (line 3), and no Greek arbitrators are mentioned by name. The Romans were perhaps successful in mediating between the two states, although it is unlikely that the senate took the time to hear all the details of the boundaries and the full argumentation of both sides. But the voluntary agreement between Thronion

3. The reference to a court numbering in the hundreds (II, line 3) may be connected to the earlier Athenian arbitration.

and Skarphai suggests that there was no need for further arbitration between them in order to settle their borders.

168. Arbitration between Megalopolis and a neighbour (?) (c. 105–102?)

Three fragmented inscriptions from Megalopolis.

I: A stone inscribed on both sides (A and B).

E. A. Gardner/G. C. Richards, *Excavations at Megalopolis* (London, 1892) pp. 129f., VIII A and B; *Hiller von Gaertringen, *IG* V.2.443 A and B.

II: Fragment (now lost); perhaps from the same stone as I.

Böckh, *CIG* 1534; Gardner/Richards, p. 131 C; *Hiller von Gaertringen, *IG* V.2.444.

III: Fragment (now lost); perhaps from the same stone as I.

G. Hirschfeld, *BullInstArch* 1873, pp. 216f.; Gardner/Richards, p. 131 D; *Hiller von Gaertringen, *IG* V.2.445.

Sonne 40; A. Wilhelm, *JÖAI* 10 (1907) p. 21; id., *Beiträge,* p. 114; B. Bravo, *ASNP* 3.10, 3 (1980) pp. 727, 736.

I: *IG* V.2.443

A [Ἐπὶ] γραμματέος τοῖc c[υνέδροις τοῦ δεῖνος, ἔτους - - - - - - καὶ τεccερα]-
[κο]cτοῦ, γερόντων Ἐχεστράτου το[ῦ - - - -, - - - - τοῦ - - - -, - - - -]
. . νου τοῦ Θεοτίμου, Χοραγικλέος τ[οῦ - - - -, - - - - τοῦ - - - -]
[τά]δε ἀπεφάναντο τοὶ ἀποcταλέν[τες Νικοκλῆc Νικομάχου]
5 [το]ῦ Νικομάχου, Φιλίcκος Ἁλιοδώρου [καὶ οἱ cύνδικοι? περὶ ὧν]
[ἐγ]ράψατο πόλις Μεγα . λοπολιτᾶν καὶ C[- - - - - - - - - -, Εὐ]-
[μα]ρίδας Ἵππωνος, Ἄλκ[ι]μος Λυκίνου, - - - - - - - - - - -
[Πρ]όξενος Ἀριστοδάμου, Ἱέρων Ἀντικ[ράτεος, - - - - - - - - - -]
. . δα· τᾶc μερίδοc πλέθρα τριάκοντα πέντ[ε ἐμετρήcαμεν, ἅτι]-
10 [να] ἦcαν περιωριγότες οἵ τε cύνδικοι κ[αὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες καθ' ὃν διεκρί]-
[νο]ντο χρόνον, τᾶι δὲ ἐχομέναι ἁμ[έραι ἐπορευcάμεθα εἰc τὸ]
. . Ῥουλειον ἔχοντες καὶ τοὺc ἄρχον[τας μεθ' ἁμῶν καὶ περιωρίca]-
[με]ν τὸν τόπον ἐξ αὐτᾶν τᾶν γειτονειᾶν [καὶ τῶν - - - τεθέν]-
[των] ὅρων, γινομένας τᾶc χώρας δαμοc[ίας, καὶ - - - - - - - -]
15 [τὸ]ν τόπον τὸν ἀντιλλεγόμενον ac[- - - - - - - - - - - - τῶν]
ἐπιτιμίων τῶν ἐξακολουθούντων κ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
χεcθαι Μεγαλοπολιτᾶν, ἀπελύcαμεν [δὲ - - - - - - - - - - - -]
αὐτῶι πρὸ τᾶc ἐπὶ τὰν χώραν ἐξόδου, c[- - - - - - - - - οἱ ὅμο]-
ροι τὸ κατὰ λόγον cυνπεριφορᾶc ἐντευ[- - - - - - - - εὕρομεν]

and Skarphai suggests that there was no need for further arbitration between them in order to settle their borders.

168. Arbitration between Megalopolis and a neighbour (?) (c. 105–102?)

Three fragmented inscriptions from Megalopolis.

I: A stone inscribed on both sides (A and B).

E. A. Gardner/G. C. Richards, *Excavations at Megalopolis* (London, 1892) pp. 129f., VIII A and B; *Hiller von Gaertringen, *IG* V.2.443 A and B.

II: Fragment (now lost); perhaps from the same stone as I.

Böckh, *CIG* 1534; Gardner/Richards, p. 131 C; *Hiller von Gaertringen, *IG* V.2.444.

III: Fragment (now lost); perhaps from the same stone as I.

G. Hirschfeld, *BullInstArch* 1873, pp. 216f.; Gardner/Richards, p. 131 D; *Hiller von Gaertringen, *IG* V.2.445.

Sonne 40; A. Wilhelm, *JÖAI* 10 (1907) p. 21; id., *Beiträge,* p. 114; B. Bravo, *ASNP* 3.10, 3 (1980) pp. 727, 736.

I: *IG* V.2.443

A [Ἐπὶ] γραμματέος τοῖc c[υνέδροις τοῦ δεῖνος, ἔτους - - - - - - καὶ τεccερα]-
[κο]cτοῦ, γερόντων Ἐχεστράτου το[ῦ - - - -, - - - - τοῦ - - - -, - - - -]
. . νου τοῦ Θεοτίμου, Χοραγικλέος τ[οῦ - - - -, - - - - τοῦ - - - -]
[τά]δε ἀπεφάναντο τοὶ ἀποcταλέν[τες Νικοκλῆc Νικομάχου]
5 [το]ῦ Νικομάχου, Φιλίcκος Ἁλιοδώρου [καὶ οἱ cύνδικοι? περὶ ὧν]
[ἐγ]ράψατο πόλις Μεγα . λοπολιτᾶν καὶ C[- - - - - - - - - -, Εὐ]-
[μα]ρίδας Ἵππωνος, Ἄλκ[ι]μος Λυκίνου, - - - - - - - - - - -
[Πρ]όξενος Ἀριστοδάμου, Ἱέρων Ἀντικ[ράτεος, - - - - - - - - - -]
. . δα· τᾶc μερίδοc πλέθρα τριάκοντα πέντ[ε ἐμετρήcαμεν, ἅτι]-
10 [να] ἦcαν περιωριγότες οἵ τε cύνδικοι κ[αὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες καθ' ὃν διεκρί]-
[νο]ντο χρόνον, τᾶι δὲ ἐχομέναι ἁμ[έραι ἐπορευcάμεθα εἰc τὸ]
. . Ῥουλειον ἔχοντες καὶ τοὺc ἄρχον[τας μεθ' ἁμῶν καὶ περιωρίca]-
[με]ν τὸν τόπον ἐξ αὐτᾶν τᾶν γειτονειᾶν [καὶ τῶν - - - τεθέν]-
[των] ὅρων, γινομένας τᾶc χώρας δαμοc[ίας, καὶ - - - - - - - -]
15 [τὸ]ν τόπον τὸν ἀντιλλεγόμενον ac[- - - - - - - - - - - - τῶν]
ἐπιτιμίων τῶν ἐξακολουθούντων κ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
χεcθαι Μεγαλοπολιτᾶν, ἀπελύcαμεν [δὲ - - - - - - - - - - - -]
αὐτῶι πρὸ τᾶc ἐπὶ τὰν χώραν ἐξόδου, c[- - - - - - - - - οἱ ὅμο]-
ροι τὸ κατὰ λόγον cυνπεριφορᾶc ἐντευ[- - - - - - - - εὕρομεν]

τοιούτους, οἳ μὴ βιάζονταί ποτε τὰ ὅμο[ρ]ᾳ, [ἀλλ' εὖ πολιτευόμε]-
νοι ποιοῦντι τὰ δίκαια. ˇ [περὶ τοῦ - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
νίου Νικοκλῆς Νικομάχου τοῦ Νικομ[άχου τάδε ἀπεφάνατο]·
περὶ τᾶς δίκας τᾶς συλικᾶς ἃς ἐγὼ [καὶ - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
νος, Πολύξενο[ς] Ἀριστάνδρου, - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
στου, Ἀριστώνυ[μ]ος Πάσων[ος - - - - - - - - - - - - - ὑπάρ]-
χειν ἐν Πλείστωι πεδίωι πας- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
τοὶ προα- - - - - - - - - - - - - -
B [Ἐπὶ] δαμιο[ργ]ῶν -
του τοῦ Σωσιγένεος -
τᾶς χώρας Πέμτου ἐνάται ἰς[ταμένου - - - - - - - - - - - - - - τι?]-
[μ]ατ[ῆ]ρας? τοὺς περι[ορίς]αν[τας - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
. ατωπλ . . 13 . . ς[- μεμις]-
[θ]ωκὼς παρὰ τοῦ πα[τέρος, τ]ὸν δὲ - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
. τοῦ πατέρος μου π[ατέρα], ἀφ' οὗ παρᾳ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
[ἐ]προτερήθης διὰ τοῦ δικαστηρίου, ἐπειδ[ὴ - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
[ς]ατε τὰν χώραν φάμε[νοι ὑπ]άρχειν τοῦτο - - - - - - - - - - - - -
. ενιοις ταῦτα τὰ χωρία μή[τε ὑπάρχει]ν δα[μόσια - - - - - - - - - -]
των πρὸ τοῦ ἐν Πλείστ[ωι] π[ε]δ[ίωι . . .]αλ- - - - - - - - - - - - -
[κ]αὶ ἔχω γείτονα τοῦ τιμάμ[α]τ[ος . . . .]ρ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
[. μ]έρος παρὰ τὰν πλευρὰν τὰν π[ρὸς ἅλι]ον ἀ[νατέλλοντα - - - - τὸ]
[πρὸ]ς δυσμὰς μέρος εἰσστὸν πε . . . . . λλο- - - - - - - - - - - - - -
. . . ε τούτου τὰ . . . . . τὰ π[ρὸς δ]υσμὰς - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
. . . . τὸν σχολ . . δ . . . ον δίκρ[ο]ο[ν] ἀποδ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
[. . . π]ρὸς ἄρκτον ἐστρεμμέναν ἐν τα[- - - - - - - - - - - - - τὰν δ]-
[δὸν τὰ]ν Ξενικὰν τὰ[ν ἐπὶ] Λακεδαίμον[α - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
. . . . . Κλεόξενος . . . . δα Μεγαλοπολ[ίτας - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
. . . . . αἱ πλέθρα πεντήκοντα οἷς γεί[των - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
[. . . . λ]ελάβηκεν ἀν[τὶ τού]του γονε- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
. . . . . σε παρὰ Δεξιμέν[εος], Θεαρίδα - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
. . . . . καὶ περιώριγα τὸ μ[έρος ὅ]ρο[ις - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
. . . . . θαι τοῦτο τὸ τίμα[μα -]
. . . . . τὶμαμα ἀρξάμ[ενος ἀπὸ - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]

10: ἄρχοντες: Haussoullier (*ap. IG*). || 12: μεθ' ἁμῶν: Haussoullier (*ap. IG*). || 43: σχολ[ιό]δ[ειρ]ον: Richards.

II: *IG* V.2.444

[Ἐπὶ] γραμματέ[ος τοῖς συνέδροις - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
. . . ου . ουτας καννα[- Ἀρις]-
τοκλέος προκλήσεις -
πόλις Μεγαλοπολιτᾶν -
Πολύξ[ενος Ἀ]ριστάνδρου, [Εὐ]μαρίδας [Ἴπ]πωνος, [Ἀριστώνυ]-
[μ]ος Πάσωνος, Πρόξενος Ἀριστοδάμου, Ἱέρω[ν Ἀντι]κράτεος, Μ[ικυ]-

λίων Νικολαΐδα [τ]ᾶc με[ρίδο]c [δ] ἄρπ[α]cτ[α]ι παν⟨τ⟩ὶ cύλω[ι, ταῦτ]α ἔφα[μεν μη]-
θενὶ ἐπιβάλλειν καὶ ν[εμό]μεθα τὰ χωρία τὰ [π]ερι̣ο[ριζ]όμενα ἀφ' ἑc]-
πέρ[ac] ἀπὸ τᾶμ πετρᾶ[ν κάτω ἕως] ε⟨ἰ⟩c τ[ὸν Πύ]τι̣ι̣[ο]ν, ἀπὸ τοῦ Πυτίου κατὰ
τὸν ῥοῦν ἕως εἰc τὸν Κοιλαγ[γί]ταν, εἶτ' ἐν τῷι Κοιλαγγίτ[αι ἕως]
εἰc τὰν ὁδὸν τὰν ἐπὶ Λυκόcουραν, ἀπὸ δὲ ἄρκτου τὰν̣ - - - - - - - - -
[ἔ]ω[c] εἰc τὰν Ἰκέτειαν, καὶ ἀπὸ τᾶc Ἰκετείας ἕως ε[ἰc τὰν ὁδὸν]
τὰν διὰ τοῦ Πυτίου, καὶ τὰν̣ ὁδὸν̣ ἐπὶ τὰc πέτ̣[ρας - - - - - - - - -]
. . εια περὶ ὧν προεκαλέcαντο Ἀριcτόδα[μοc - - - - - - - - - - -]
. . . . νοις καὶ δαμόcια, ἄλλωι δὲ μηθ̣[ενὶ - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
. . . . 15 . . . . ει απ- - - - - - - -

2: [θ]ύτας?: Böckh. || 3: προκάτιcε, Ἰc-: Böckh. || 5: Πολύc[τρατος]: Böckh. || 6: Ἰάc[ο]νοc: Böckh. Ἱέρω[ν Ἱπ]ποκράτεοc: Böckh. || 7: [τ]ᾶc μ[ερίδο]c: Haussoullier (*ap. IG*). || 8: τὰ χωρία τὰ ceίτου? νομο-: Böckh. || 9: ἀφ' ἑcπ[έρας ἐπ]ὶ? τὰν: Böckh. || 11: τὰν [ὁδὸν]: Böckh. || 12: [τὰ]ν εἰc τὰν Ἰκετείαν: Böckh. || 13: τὰ[ν] ὁδ[ὸ]ν [τὰν]: Böckh.

III: *IG* V.2.445

[- Ἀριcτώνυ]μοc Πάcωνο[c καὶ πόλιc Με]-
[γα]λοπολιτᾶν cυ[λικὰν δίκαν? πρ]οκαλεcαμέν̣α[- - - - - - - - - - πρό]-
τ̣ερον ὑπὸ τῶν ματαί[ων? εἰc] μ̣ίccθωcιν, ἐξ ὧν κ[αὶ φώρια? ἐλάβω, καὶ - - -]
. . οιc καὶ δαμόcια καὶ Γ . ΟΝ̣ΤΑΝΣ, ἃc cύ με ce[c]ύλα[χαc - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
πᾶcαν τὰν χώραν, περὶ ἃc cε προκαλεcαμένα πά̣[λιν ἐπροτερήθηc διὰ τοῦ]
δικαcτηρίου καὶ κατὰ παρεύρεcιν κρατεῖν τὰ π̣- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
[τ]ῶν δι[α]δικαc̣θ̣[έντ]ω̣ν̣ πλέθρων διακοcίων, ὧν̣ [τὸ πλέθρον δραχμαὶ πεντήκον]-
[τα] καὶ τετρακόcιαι. τὸ ἀδίκημα ἔτι καὶ ἔτουc τρ̣[ίτου καὶ τεccαρακοcτοῦ?]
. . Ι̣Ι̣Ι̣ ταc̣ τᾶc πόλιοc. πόλιc Μεγαλοπολιτᾶν Μεγ- - - - - - - - - - - - -
. . . Φιλοποίμενος, Πολύξενος Ἀριcτάνδρου, [Εὐ]μα̣[ρίδας Ἴππωνος, - - - -]
. . . . Ἀριcτώνυμος Πάcωνος, Πρόξενος Ἀριcτ̣οδ[άμου - - - - - - - - - - - -]
. . . . ιλου, ὅτι ἐμοῦ προκαλεcαμένας cε ἐπὶ cύλωι ο̣- - - - - - - - - - - -
. . . . ν εἰc μίcθωcιν, ἐξ ὧν καὶ φώ̣ρια [ἐ]λάβω, καὶ πρ[- - -οιc καὶ δαμόcια καὶ]
. . . . αν . ἃc cύ με cεcύλαχαc μὲν δ[υ]cὶ cύλοιc α- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
[προκ]αλεcαμένα περιώριcα οὔτε τοὺc ὅρουc γραφ̣[ομένουc - - - - - - - - -]
[χώ]ραc οὔτε οὔcαc ἐν τούτωι τῶι περιοριcμῶι [- - - - - - - - - - - ἃc cὺ]
[. ce]cύλαχαc διὰ τοῦ ἀμοῦ [c]ύλου, μεταφέρων [τοὺc ὅρουc καὶ - - - - - - -]
ἔτουc τετάρτου καὶ τεccαραχ[οcτ]οῦ . ΙΡ- - - - - - - - - - - - - -

3: ⟨τι⟩ματ̣[ή]ρ̣[ων] instead of ματαί[ων]: Haussoullier (*ap. IG*).

This collection of fragments from Megalopolis clearly deals with some kind of judgement that at least in part pertained to land. But whether the inscriptions refer to internal disputes, to disputes between Megalopolis and its

neighbours, or to disputes between individual Megalopolitans and citizens of other states is uncertain. Böckh, in reference to document II, argued that it represented a distribution of lands between Megalopolitans and certain unidentified opponents; Wilamowitz considered it to be a question of disagreement over public versus private lands.[1] The references in several of the fragments to the "city of the Megalopolitans" point to an external rather than an internal conflict. This is particularly apparent in I A (lines 5–6), where it seems that Megalopolis had communicated something, probably a complaint, to the party generating the decree. Since the inscription then goes on to mention the delimitation of certain lands, as well as the presence of *syndikoi*, or advocates, some kind of arbitration over territory may be the focus of these fragments.

We cannot, however, go much beyond that or assert that this is a definite case of public arbitration by a third party over the borders between Megalopolis and one of its neighbours. For one thing, the identity of a neighbouring state or states appears nowhere in the fragments. For another, suits over *sylai* were also involved. Some transgression of boundaries and seizure of goods had taken place, and these are actions that might have opposed either individual Megalopolitans and citizens of another state or the states themselves. Contested lands, seizure of goods, and fines or estimates of damages all form part of the complex of problems evidently dealt with by the judges or arbitrators, who may have been from a third neutral state. Böckh, who dated this inscription to the early third century, thought that the Achaian League might be involved. Although the inscription has been downdated to the end of the second century by later editors, it is not impossible that there was some involvement on the part of a regenerated federation.[2]

169. The senate arbitrates a land dispute between Abdera and Kotys of Thrace (late second/early first century)

An inscription from Teos. The inscription is in two pieces, both of roughly the same dimensions: h: 1.95 m; w: 0.25 m; d: 0.30 m.

E. Pottier/M. Hauvette-Besnault, *BCH* 4 (1880) pp. 47–59; W. Dittenberger, *SIG*^{2} 303; Michel 325; *Dittenberger/Hiller von Gaertringen, *SIG*^{3} 656; *IGRR* IV.1558.

1. See Gardner/Richards, p. 132; Sonne 40.

2. References to the *synedroi* might suggest this, as well as a dating scheme that might be founded on years counted from the destruction of Corinth.

neighbours, or to disputes between individual Megalopolitans and citizens of other states is uncertain. Böckh, in reference to document II, argued that it represented a distribution of lands between Megalopolitans and certain unidentified opponents; Wilamowitz considered it to be a question of disagreement over public versus private lands.[1] The references in several of the fragments to the "city of the Megalopolitans" point to an external rather than an internal conflict. This is particularly apparent in I A (lines 5–6), where it seems that Megalopolis had communicated something, probably a complaint, to the party generating the decree. Since the inscription then goes on to mention the delimitation of certain lands, as well as the presence of *syndikoi*, or advocates, some kind of arbitration over territory may be the focus of these fragments.

We cannot, however, go much beyond that or assert that this is a definite case of public arbitration by a third party over the borders between Megalopolis and one of its neighbours. For one thing, the identity of a neighbouring state or states appears nowhere in the fragments. For another, suits over *sylai* were also involved. Some transgression of boundaries and seizure of goods had taken place, and these are actions that might have opposed either individual Megalopolitans and citizens of another state or the states themselves. Contested lands, seizure of goods, and fines or estimates of damages all form part of the complex of problems evidently dealt with by the judges or arbitrators, who may have been from a third neutral state. Böckh, who dated this inscription to the early third century, thought that the Achaian League might be involved. Although the inscription has been downdated to the end of the second century by later editors, it is not impossible that there was some involvement on the part of a regenerated federation.[2]

169. The senate arbitrates a land dispute between Abdera and Kotys of Thrace (late second/early first century)

An inscription from Teos. The inscription is in two pieces, both of roughly the same dimensions: h: 1.95 m; w: 0.25 m; d: 0.30 m.

E. Pottier/M. Hauvette-Besnault, *BCH* 4 (1880) pp. 47–59; W. Dittenberger, *SIG*^{2} 303; Michel 325; *Dittenberger/Hiller von Gaertringen, *SIG*^{3} 656; *IGRR* IV.1558.

1. See Gardner/Richards, p. 132; Sonne 40.

2. References to the *synedroi* might suggest this, as well as a dating scheme that might be founded on years counted from the destruction of Corinth.

A. Wilhelm, *GGA* 1898, p. 226; B. Haussoullier, *RCr* 1900, p. 27; M. Holleaux, *REA* 3 (1901) p. 130 n. 1; A. Wilhelm, *MDAI(A)* 1914, pp. 185–86; id., *Neue Beiträge* 5, pp. 5–9; 6, p. 33; R. Laqueur, *Epigraphische Untersuchungen zu den griechischen Volksbeschlüssen* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1927) pp. 73–75; A. Wilhelm, *JÖAI* 24 (1929) pp. 172–74, 177–84; id., *AAWW* 1930, pp. 91–102;L. Robert, *BCH* 59 (1935) pp. 507–13 (= *Opera Minora*, vol. 1, pp. 320–26); Magie, *Buckler Studies*, pp. 177–78; id., *RRAM*, vol. 2, pp. 960–61; Wilhelm, *GIRI*, p. 79; *SEG* XIII.408; Robert, *REG* 1961, 389; *SEG* XIX.687; Robert, *REG* 1969, 7; E. Condurachi, *Latomus* 29 (1970) pp. 581–94; P. Herrmann, *ZPE* 7 (1971) pp. 72–77; Robert, *REG* 1971, 564; id., *REG* 1972, 270; L. Robert, *Journal des savants* 1976, pp. 212–13 n. 237; G. Chiranky, *Athenaeum* 60 (1982) pp. 461–81; Gruen, p. 107; Sherk, *TDGR* 26; Eckstein, *Historia* 37 (1988) p. 425. See also the bibliography assembled by Chiranky, pp. 470–71 n. 55.

Ὁ δῆμος ὁ Ἀβ[δηριτῶν]
Ἀμύμο- Μεγάθυ-
να Ἐπι- μον Ἀθη-
κούρου. ναίου.

ἐπειδὴ χρείας τῶι δήμ[ωι γενο]μένης πρεσβείας εἰς
Ῥώμην ὑπὲρ τῆς πατρίο[υ χώρας] περὶ ἧς ἐπιδοὺς ἀξίω-
μα βασιλεὺς Θρᾳκῶν Κότ[υς συ]γκλήτωι διά τε τοῦ υἱοῦ
αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν ἀμ' ἐκείν[ωι ἐξ]αποσταλέντων ὑπ' [αὐ]-
τοῦ πρεσβευτῶν ᾔτει τ[ὴν π]άτριον ἡμῶν χώραν,
αἱρεθέντες πρεσβευτα[ὶ ὑπὸ το]ῦ δήμου τοῦ Τηίων Ἀμύ-
μων τε Ἐπικούρου καὶ Μ[εγάθυμ]ος Ἀθηναίου, ἄνδρες
καλοὶ καὶ ἀγαθοὶ καὶ ἄξ[ιοι σφετέρ]ας πατρίδος καὶ εὔνοι
τῶι ἡμετέρωι δήμωι, ὅ[ντες, τὴ]ν πᾶσαν σπουδήν τε καὶ
φιλοτιμίαν εἰσήνεγκαν, [προθυμ]ίας οὐδὲν ἐλλείπον-
τες· ἔν τε γὰρ ταῖς συνεδ[ρίαις τ]αῖς γενομέναις ὑπὲρ τῆς
χώρας πᾶσαν ἐπίνοιαν π[αρέσχ]οντο χάριν τοῦ μηθὲν π[α]-
ραλειφθῆναι τῶν δυναμ[ένων ἐπα]νορθῶσαι τὰ πράγματα, ἀ-
ρατὴν ἅμα καὶ σωτήριον [περὶ τῶ]ν ἀπορουμένων ἀεὶ π[ρο]-
τιθέντες γνώμην· εἴς τε [Ῥώμην π]ρεσβεύσαντες ὑπὲρ τοῦ
δήμου ψυχικὴν ἅμα καὶ σω[ματικὴν] ὑπέμειναν [κ]α[κ]οπαθίαν,
ἐντυγχάνοντες μὲν τοῖ[ς πρώτοι]ς Ῥωμαίων καὶ ἐξομηρευ-
όμενοι διὰ τῆς καθ' ἡμέρα[ν προσκυν]ήσεως, καταστησάμε-
νοι δὲ τοὺς πάτρωνας τῆς [πατρί]δος εἰς τὴν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἡμε-
τέρου δήμου βοήθειαν, τ[οὺς δὲ προ]νοουμένους τοῦ ἀντιδίκου
ἡμῶν καὶ προστατοῦνται[ς διὰ τῆς τ]ῶν πραγμάτων παραθέσει-
ώς τε καὶ τῆς καθ' ἡμέρα[ν γενομέν]ης ἐφοδείας ἐπὶ τῶν ἀτρέ-
ων ἐφιλοποιοῦντο· περὶ δ[ὴ τούτων ἔ]δοξεν τῆι βουλῆι καὶ τῶι δή-
μωι τῶι Ἀβδηριτῶν ἐπαιν[έσαι το]ὺς προγεγραμμένους ἄν-
δρας καὶ καλεῖσθαι εἰς προ[εδρίαν κατ'] ἐνιαυτὸν Διονυσίων τῶι ἀ-
γῶνι ἕως ἂν ζῶσιν, καὶ [στεφανοῦς]θαι χρυσῶι στεφάνωι ἐν ἀγ[ῶνι]
τὴν ἀναγγελίαν ποιουμέν[ου τοῦ] κήρυκος, διότι, ὁ δῆμος στε-
φανοῖ χρυσῶι στεφάνωι Ἀ[μύμονα Ἐ]πικούρου Τήιον ἀρετῆς ἕνε-

κεν καὶ εὐνοίας τῆς εἰς ἑα[υτόν, καὶ Με]γάθυμον Ἀθηναίου Τήιον χρυ-
σῶι στεφάνωι ἀρετῆς ἕνε[κεν καὶ εὐν]οίας τῆς εἰς ἑαυτόν. οἱ δὲ νο-
μοφύλακες οἱ ἐπὶ ἱερέως Ἡ[. . . . . ἀν]αγραψάτωσαν τόδε τὸ ψήφισ-
μα εἰς στήλην λευκοῦ λίθ[ου καὶ στησά]τωσαν ἐν τῶι ἐπιφανεστά-
τωι τόπωι τῆς ἀγορᾶς, ἵνα [πάντες γ]ινώσκωσιν τήν τοῦ δήμου
προθυμίαν ἣν ἔχει πρὸς τ[οὺς καλοὺς] καὶ ἀγαθοὺς [τῶν] ἀν[δρῶν. καὶ ἐ]-
λέσθωσαν οἱ νομοφύλακ[ες πρεσβε]υτὰς δύο πρὸς Τηΐους, οἵτ[ιν]ες
ἀποδημήσαντες εἰς Τέ[ων καὶ δό]ντες τόδε τὸ ψήφισμα παρακα-
λέσουσιν Τηΐους προσαγγ[εῖλαι τὰς ἐ]ψηφισμένας ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου ἡ-
μῶν τοῖς πολίταις αὐτῶν [τιμάς, καὶ c]υγχωρῆσαι τοῖς πρεσβε[υταῖς]
στῆσαι στήλην λευκοῦ λίθ[ου ἐν τῶι ἐ]πιφανεστάτωι τόπωι, ἐν [ᾗι]
ἀναγραφήσεται τόδε τὸ ψή[φισμα· τὸ δ]ὲ γενόμενον ἀνάλωμα ἐπί
τε τὴν στήλην καὶ ἐπὶ ἀναγ[ραφὴν] τοῦ ψηφίσματος ἀπο[λογισά]-
μενοι τῆι πόλει οἱ πρεσβε[υταί, ὅπω]c ἀμείβωνται, κομι[ζόντων]
ἀπὸ τῆς τραπέζης, θεμέν[ων αὐτοῖς τὸ διπλάσιον τῶν νομοφυλάκ-
ων ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς τὰς πρεσβ[είας. τὸ δὲ] ψήφισμα τόδε εἶναι εἰς εὐχα-
ριστίαν τοῦ δήμου. ε[ἰρέθησα]ν πρεσβευταὶ Ἡρακλεί-
δης Ἀλκίφρονος, Ἀλκ[ίφρων Δη]μητρίου.

9: ἤτειτ[ο τὴν π]άτριον: Pottier/Hauvette-Besnault, Michel. || 10: αἱρεθέντες πρεσβευτα[ὶ ἐκ το]ῦ δήμου τοῦ Τηίων: J. Seibert, *Metropolis und Apoikie* (1963), rejected by Robert, *Journal des savants*. || 12: [τῆς ἰδί]ας πατρίδος: Robert. || 13: οἵ[c προcῆκε?]ν: Pottier/Hauvette-Besnault. 14: [προθ]υμίας: Herrmann. || 17–18: ἀ|ρίστην: Robert. || 18: [πραγμάτω]ν: Pottier/Hauvette-Besnault. ὑ[πέρ τῶ]ν ἀπορουμένων: Herrmann. || 18–19: προ[c]τιθέντες γνώμην: Herrmann. || 19: εἰς Τη[ίους, καὶ π]ρεσβεύσαντες: Pottier/Hauvette-Besnault. γνώμην εἰς τὴ[ν- -]: Michel. || 20: καὶ cω[τήριον] ὑπέμειναν ἰδιοπάθιαν: Pottier/Hauvette-Besnault. ἰδιοπάθιαν: Michel. κ[α]κοπαθίαν: Herrmann. || 21: τοῖ[c ἡγουμένοι]c Ῥωμαίων: Robert. || 22: ἡμέρα[ν ἁπαντ]ήσεως: Robert. διὰ τῆc καθ' ἡμέρα[ν καρ]τερήσεως: Herrmann. || 22–23: παραστησάμε|νοι: Herrmann. || 23: τοὺς πάτρωνας τῆς [πόλ]εως: Herrmann. || 24: βοήθειάν τ[ε καὶ προ]νοουμένους: Pottier/Hauvette-Besnault. τ[οὺς προ]νοουμένους: Michel. τ[ινάς τε προ]νοουμένους: suggested by Robert. || 25–26: προστατοῦνται[c ἡμετέρ?]ων πραγμάτων παραθέσει,| ὥcτε: Pottier/Hauvette-Besnault. προστατοῦνται[c αὐτοῦ, πολλ]ῶν πραγμάτων παραθέσει,| ὥcτε: Michel. || 26–27: ἀτρε[ί]|ων: Pottier/Hauvette-Besnault. ἐπὶ τῶν ἀτρίων: Herrmann. || 30: ἐc ἀεί: Herrmann. || 36: [ἀναθέ]τωσαν: Pottier/Hauvette-Besnault. || 37: [πάντες κο]ινῶc ἴδωcιν: Pottier/Hauvette-Besnault. ἵνα [δὲ Τήῖοι γ]ινώκωcιν: Herrmann. || 38–39: [καὶ cπευ?]|δέcθωcαν: Pottier/Hauvette-Besnault. || 42–43: πρεcβε[ῦcιν ἀνα]|cτῆcαι: Pottier/Hauvette-Besnault. || 45: ἐπὶ ἀναγ[γελίαν τὴν]: Pottier/Hauvette-Besnault. || 45–46: ἀπογραψά|μενοι ... κομιcά[c]θωcαν: Herrmann. || 46: πρεcβε[υταὶ Τηίου?]c: Pottier/Hauvette-Besnault. κομι[ζόμενοι]: Pottier/Hauvette-Besnault.

This inscription, a decree of Abdera discovered at Teos, tells of the territorial rivalry between the state of Abdera and Kotys of Thrace. Kotys laid a claim before the Roman senate to a piece of land claimed as ancestral territory by the

Abderitans. Abdera thereupon turned to its mother city Teos for help, no doubt because the Teians had more influential connections at Rome.[1] The Teians responded by appointing two of their citizens to act as advocates of Abdera's cause before the Roman senate; this decree honours those two ambassadors. At Rome, the Teian advocates are said to have joined the ranks of the *clientes*, doing the morning rounds of *salutationes*, and gaining the friendship of important individuals for Abdera's cause (lines 21–27). Clearly personal connections and private persuasion were of paramount importance. Nevertheless, in spite of the Teian efforts, for which the Abderitans gratefully thank them, they were probably ultimately unsuccessful. The decree is complete, and yet there is no mention of a Teian-Abderitan victory in the matter.[2]

The date of this inscription has been much debated. It had been supposed that it represented an effort by Kotys, the Thracian king of the 160s, to benefit in the aftermath of the Third Macedonian War, and claim part of his neighbour's territory. The recent and persuasive arguments of Chiranky, however, favour a date late in the second century or early in the first, and an identification of the Kotys of this inscription with the Kotys mentioned by Diodoros (37.5a), who helped to prevent some kind of Macedonian uprising between 93 and 87. His apparently good relations with Rome would account for the Abderitan concerns about the degree of their own influence in Rome, as well as the probability that the senate found in Kotys's favour.[3]

170. Ephesos and Sardis conclude an arbitration treaty (98/7 or 94/3)

Five fragments of a marble stele from Pergamon. The first three (A, B, and C) contain the remains of two letters from Q. Mucius Scaevola, the proconsul of Asia, to the states of Sardis (I) and Ephesos (II). The other two (D and E) contain the treaty between Ephesos and Sardis (IV). A: h: 0.105 m; w: 0.135 m. B: h: 0.1 m; w: 0.12 m. C: h: 0.31 m; w: 0.345 m; d: 0.06 m. D: h: 0.13 m; w: 0.125 m. E: h: 0.817 m; w: 0.694–0.698 m; d: 0.11–0.14 m. The width of the upper part of the stele was probably about 0.65 m, the original height about 2.0 m. A fragment of an inscription from Sardis (III) may belong to the first part of the treaty, missing in the copy from Pergamon (IV).

1. The *patrones* referred to at line 23 must be the patrons of Teos; cf. Robert, *BCH* 59, p. 513.

2. See Robert, *BCH* 59, p. 513; Condurachi, p. 586

3. Condurachi (pp. 586f.) argues that the ἰδία γῆ of Abdera, restored to that state by Hadrian (G. Bakalakis, *Thrakika* 8 [1937] pp. 26f.), is identical with the territory in dispute between Abdera and Kotys.

Abderitans. Abdera thereupon turned to its mother city Teos for help, no doubt because the Teians had more influential connections at Rome.[1] The Teians responded by appointing two of their citizens to act as advocates of Abdera's cause before the Roman senate; this decree honours those two ambassadors. At Rome, the Teian advocates are said to have joined the ranks of the *clientes*, doing the morning rounds of *salutationes*, and gaining the friendship of important individuals for Abdera's cause (lines 21–27). Clearly personal connections and private persuasion were of paramount importance. Nevertheless, in spite of the Teian efforts, for which the Abderitans gratefully thank them, they were probably ultimately unsuccessful. The decree is complete, and yet there is no mention of a Teian-Abderitan victory in the matter.[2]

The date of this inscription has been much debated. It had been supposed that it represented an effort by Kotys, the Thracian king of the 160s, to benefit in the aftermath of the Third Macedonian War, and claim part of his neighbour's territory. The recent and persuasive arguments of Chiranky, however, favour a date late in the second century or early in the first, and an identification of the Kotys of this inscription with the Kotys mentioned by Diodoros (37.5a), who helped to prevent some kind of Macedonian uprising between 93 and 87. His apparently good relations with Rome would account for the Abderitan concerns about the degree of their own influence in Rome, as well as the probability that the senate found in Kotys's favour.[3]

170. Ephesos and Sardis conclude an arbitration treaty (98/7 or 94/3)

Five fragments of a marble stele from Pergamon. The first three (A, B, and C) contain the remains of two letters from Q. Mucius Scaevola, the proconsul of Asia, to the states of Sardis (I) and Ephesos (II). The other two (D and E) contain the treaty between Ephesos and Sardis (IV). A: h: 0.105 m; w: 0.135 m. B: h: 0.1 m; w: 0.12 m. C: h: 0.31 m; w: 0.345 m; d: 0.06 m. D: h: 0.13 m; w: 0.125 m. E: h: 0.817 m; w: 0.694–0.698 m; d: 0.11–0.14 m. The width of the upper part of the stele was probably about 0.65 m, the original height about 2.0 m. A fragment of an inscription from Sardis (III) may belong to the first part of the treaty, missing in the copy from Pergamon (IV).

1. The *patrones* referred to at line 23 must be the patrons of Teos; cf. Robert, *BCH* 59, p. 513.

2. See Robert, *BCH* 59, p. 513; Condurachi, p. 586

3. Condurachi (pp. 586f.) argues that the ἰδία γῆ of Abdera, restored to that state by Hadrian (G. Bakalakis, *Thrakika* 8 [1937] pp. 26f.), is identical with the territory in dispute between Abdera and Kotys.

I: Fränkel, *IPergamon* 268 A and C, column I; Dittenberger, *OGIS* 437 I A, a and b, lines 1–25; Lafaye, *IGRR* IV.297.1–37; *Sherk 47, column 1, A and C, lines 1–25; Wankel, *IEphesos* Ia.7 I, a and (a).

II: Fränkel, *IPergamon* 268 A, B, and C, column II; Dittenberger, *OGIS* 437 II B, a and b, lines 26–55; Lafaye. *IGRR* IV.297.38–61; *Sherk 47, column 2, A, B, and C, lines 26–57; Wankel, *IEphesos* Ia.7 I, b and (b).

III: W. H. Buckler/D. M. Robinson, *Sardis* VII.1 (1932) 6; *Wankel, *IEphesos* Ia.7 II, "Sardis 6."

IV: Fränkel, *IPergamon* 268 D and E; Dittenberger, *OGIS* 437 III C, lines 56–96; Lafaye, *IGRR* IV.297.62–102; *Wankel, *IEphesos* Ia.7 II.

Sonne 47; P. Foucart, *RPh* 25 (1901) pp. 85–88; Hitzig 36; Raeder 80; Tod 60; Tod, *Sidelights,* p. 46; G. Luzzatto, *Epigrafia giuridica greca e romana* (Rome, 1942) pp. 133–35; Magie, *RRAM*, vol. 1, p. 174; vol. 2, pp. 1064f.; Broughton, vol. 2, pp. 5–6; L. Robert, *REA* 62 (1960) pp. 342–46; Robert, *REG* 1961, 656; H. Müller, *Chiron* 5 (1975) pp. 140–41, 144; Robert, *REG* 1981, 433; Sherwin-White, p. 236; Sherk, *TDGR* 57; Broughton, vol. 3, pp. 145–46; K. J. Rigsby, *TAPhA* 118 (1988) pp. 141–49.

I: Scaevola's letter to Sardis (+ heading)

[Συνθῆκαι Σαρδια]νῶν κ[αὶ Ἐφεσί]ων.
[Κόιντος Μούκιος Ποπλίου υἱὸς Σκαιόλας,]
[ἀνθύπατος Ῥωμαίων, Σαρδιανῶν τῆι βουλῆι κ]αὶ
[τῶι δήμωι χαίρειν. τῶν ἐν τῆι φιλίαι κριθέντω]ν{ι}
[δήμων τε καὶ ἐθνῶν ψηφισαμένων τιθέ]ναι
[θυμελικοὺς καὶ γυμνικοὺς ἀγῶνας πε]ντα-
[ετηρικοὺς - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]

[lines missing]

[- - - - - - - - - - - - - εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ σ]υμ-
[πορεύοιντο, ἐπέμψαμεν . . . . . σον] Φυλο-
[τίμου Ἀθηναῖον τῶν - - - - -, ἄν]δρα κα-
[λὸν καὶ ἀγαθὸν καὶ τῆς μεγίστης ἀξι]ούμε-
[νον πίστεως παρ' ἡμῖν, πρός τε τὸν ὑ]μέτε-
[ρον δῆμον καὶ τὸν Ἐφεσίων, τὸν παρ]α[κα]λέ-
[σοντα δοῦναι τὰς χεῖρας ἡμῖν εἰς] σύλλυ-
[σιν. συγκαταθεμένων δὲ τῶν δήμω]ν ἑκα-
[τέρων τοῖς παρακαλουμένοις καὶ πεμψά]ν-
[των πρεσβευτὰς ὑμῶν μὲν τοὺς στρατ]η-
[γοὺς Μενεκράτην Διοδώρου, Φοίνικα Φοί]-
[νικος, Ἀρχέλαον Θεοφίλου, Ἐφεσίων δὲ]
[Ἱκέσιον Ἀρτεμιδώρου, Ποσειδώνιον]
[Ποσειδωνίου τοῦ Διονυσίου, Ἀριστο]-
[γείτονα Πάτρωνος, Ἀρτεμίδωρον Ἀρτε]-

[μιδώρου, Μενεκράτην Μενεκράτου τοῦ]
[Ἀρτεμιδώρου, Ἀπολλόδωρον Ἑρμοκράτου],
[Ἕρμιππον Μενοίτου - - - - - - - - - - -]
[lines missing]

4: the stone reads NI. [νυ]νὶ: Fränkel.

II: Scaevola's letter to Ephesos

Κόιντος Μού[κιος Ποπλίου υ]ἱὸς Cκαιό[λας],
ἀνθύπατος Ῥω[μαίων, Ἐφεσί]ων τῆι βουλ[ῆι καὶ]
τῶι δήμωι χαί[ρειν· τῶν ἐν τῆ]ι φιλίαι κριθέ[ντων]
δήμων τε καὶ ἐ[θνῶν ψηφισαμέ]νων τιθέναι θυμ[ε]-
λικοὺc κ[α]ὶ [γυμνικοὺc ἀγῶ]να⟨c⟩ πενταετηρι-
[κοὺc βουλευcαμένων - - - - - -α]ι περὶ τοῦ
[- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - πρ]οτρεψο-
- -
[lines missing]
- - - - - - - - -ΕΝΟΣ- - - - - - - - - - - - -
[- - - - - Cαρδια]νῶν τι ταρ[αcc- - - - - - -]
[- - - ἔχ]θραν καὶ διαφορὰν κα- - - - - - - -
ἐπιφανεστέρας καὶ ἐνδοξ⟨ο⟩τ[έρας, ἵνα οἱ ἀφ]-
εστηκότες αὐτῶν δῆμοι μετ[ὰ πάcης εὐνοί]-
ας εἰc τὸ αὐτὸ{υ}cυμπορεύοιντο, ἐπέμ[ψαμεν - - -]
cον Φυλοτίμου Ἀθηναῖο[ν τ]ῶν ε- - - - - - - - -
ἄνδρα κ[αλ]ὸν καὶ ἀγαθὸ[ν] καὶ τῆc [μεγίcτης ἀξι]-
ούμενον πίcτεως παρ' [ἡμ]ῖν, πρόc [τε τὸν ὑμέ]-
τερον δῆμον καὶ τὸν Cαρδιανῶ[ν, τὸν παρακα]-
λέcαντα δοῦναι τ[ὰ]c χεῖρας ἡμῖν εἰ[c cύλλυcιν.]
cυγκαταθεμένων δὲ τῶν δήμων [ἑκατέρων]
τοῖc παρακαλουμένοις καὶ πεμψάντω[ν πρεc]-
βευτὰc ὑμῶν μὲν Ἰκέcιον Ἀρτεμιδώρο[υ, Ποcει]-
δώνιον Ποcειδωνίου τοῦ Διονυcίου, Ἀ[ριcτο]-
γείτονα Πάτρωνοc, Ἀρτεμίδωρον Ἀρτ[εμιδώ]-
ρου, Μενεκράτην Μενε[κρά]τ[ου] τοῦ Ἀρ[τεμι]-
δώρου, Ἀπολλόδ[ωρον Ἑρμο]κρ[άτου, Ἕρμιπ]-
πον Μενοίτου, Cα[ρδιανῶν δὲ τοὺc cτρατη]-
γοὺc Μενεκράτ[ην Διοδώρου, Φοίνικα Φοίνικοc],
Ἀρχέλαον Θεο[φίλου - - - - - - - - - - -]
κῆcαι τὰ πρ- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
τε μειτε[ύειν - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
cυμφέρε[ιν - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
[lines missing]

3: [τῶν νυνὶ] φιλίαι: Fränkel. || 4: καὶ ἐ[τέρων κοινω]νῶν: Fränkel. || 5: NA. || 9: [-μ]ενος δ . π-: Wankel. || 12: ΕΝΔΟΞΘΤ. || 15: [τ]ῶν ἐ[μ Περγάμωι]:

Fränkel. [τ]ῶν ε[ὐδοκίμων]: Dittenberger. [τ]ῶν ἐ[μῶν φίλων]: Robert; but Sherk thinks ἡμῶν would be more suitable to the epistolary style.

III: The fragment from Sardis

- -
[- - - - - ἐὰν δέ τις Cαρδιανῶν βούληται] πολιτεύεcθαι ἐν [Ἐφέcωι],
[ἐπικληρῶcαι αὐτὸν τοὺc ἐccῆνας ε]ἰc φυλὴν καὶ χιλιαcτ[ὺν καὶ εἶ]-
[ναι αὐτῶι ἔφοδον ἐπὶ τὴν βουλὴν καὶ τὸ]ν δῆμον καὶ τέλη φ[έρειν]
[αὐτὸν ἴcα καὶ ὅμοια τοῖc ἄλλοις τοῖc τὴν] πόλιν οἰκοῦcιν· ὅ τ[ι δὲ ἂν δι]-
5 [άγηι τιc διὰ Cάρδεων εἰc Ἔφεcον ἢ διὰ Ἐφέco]υ εἰc Cάρδειc, δια[γωγὴν]
[τούτου εἶναι αὐτῶι ἀτελεῖ -]
- -

IV: The treaty between Ephesos and Sardis

- -ονταc τ .
- -c ἐκκλήτουc δ[ί]-
[καc - παρ]αγένηται, δικάζεcθαι τὸν ἀδι-
[κο]ύμενο[ν κατὰ τὰ προγεγραμμ]ένα ἐν τ̣ῆι [τ]οῦ ἀδικοῦντοc πόλει. ἐὰν δέ τις cυλη-
5 [θ]ῆι ἢ ἀδικη[θῆι Cαρδιανῶν ἢ Ἐφ]εcίων ὑπὸ τοῦ μὴ ὄντοc μήτε Cαρδιανοῦ μήτε Ἐφεcίου,
ἐξέcτω{ι}τῶι Ἐφ[εcίωι ἐν Cάρδεcι κ]αὶ τῶι Cαρδιανῶι ἐν Ἐφέcωι τὸ δίκαιον λαμβάνειν κατὰ
τοὺc τῆc πόλε[ωc νόμουc, ἐν ᾗι] ἂν ληφθῆι ὁ ἀδικήcαc, πλὴν εἴ τινέc εἰcιν ἐκ τῶν πόλεων, πρὸc
ἃc εἰcιν cυνθῆκ[αι ἴδιαι· τότε] διεξάγεcθαι κατὰ τὰc ἰδίαc cυνθήκαc. ὅcα δ' ἂν κατὰ πόλε-
μον μεθιcτῇ τι[c ἢ καὶ κατ' ἄ]λλο τι ὑπεκτιθῆται εἰc τὴν πόλιν ἢ τὴν χώραν ἢ Ἐφεcίων εἰc
10 Cάρδειc ἢ Cαρδ[ιανῶν ε]ἰc Ἔφεcον, ἐπιδέχεcθαί τε καὶ τοὺc ἄρχοντας ἐπιμέλεcθαι καὶ
[cυνδια]cώζειν. [Ἐφεcίω]ν δὲ καὶ τῶν κατοικούντων ἐν Ἐφέcωι καὶ τῇ χώραι μηθεὶc cτρα-
[τευέcθω κατὰ Cαρδ]ιανῶν μηδὲ δίοδον διδότω μηδὲ ξενολόγιον παρεχέτω μηδὲ ὅπ⟨λ⟩α
[διδότω μηδὲ χορηγ]είτω τοῖc Cαρδιανῶν πολεμίοιc μήτε χρήματα μήτε ἀγοράν μηδ[ὲ]
[λάφυρον ἐπιδεχέc]θω μηδὲ ἄλλο μηθὲν ἐπὶ βλάβῃ πραccέτω, ὁμοίωc δὲ μηδὲ Cαρδ[ι]-
15 [ανῶν μηθεὶc μ]ηδὲ τῶ[ν] κατοικοῦντων ἐν Cάρδεcιν ἢ τῆι χώραι cτρατευέcθω κατὰ Ἐφ[ε]-
[cίων μηδὲ δίο]δον διδότ̣ω μηδὲ ξενολόγιον παρεχέτω μηδὲ ὅπλα διδότω μηδὲ χορη̣-

[γείτω τοῖς Ἐφεσ]ίων πολεμίοις μήτε χρήματα μήτε ἀγορὰν μηδὲ λάφυρον ἐπιδεχέσθω μη-
[δὲ ἄλλο μηδ]ὲν ἐπὶ βλάβηι πρασσέτω, ὁπότερος δ' ἂν τῶν δήμων ὑπεναντίον
[πράσσηι τ]ινὶ τῶν ἐν τῆιδε τῆι συνθήκηι κατακεχωρισμένων, εἶναι τὸ δίκαιον λαβεῖν τῷ ἀδι-
[κουμένωι ἐ]πὶ τῆς λαχούσης πόλεως ἐξ ὧν ἂν κατὰ κοινὸν ἕλωνται πόλεων, γενομένου κλήρου ἀπὸ
[τῆς μεσ]ιτευούσης τὰς συνθήκας πόλεως. ὁ δὲ φάμενος ἀδικεῖσθαι δῆμος προλεγέτω δι-
[ὰ πρεσ]βείας τῶι ἐγκαλουμένωι δήμωι τὸ ἔγκλημα καὶ παραγεινέσθωσαν οἱ παρ' ἑκατέρων
[τ]ῶν πό[λεω]ν εἰς τὴν διαδικασίαν, ἀφ' ἧς ἂν τὸ ψήφισμα οἱ ἐγκαλοῦντες ἀναδῶσιν ἐν ἄλ-
λαις ἡμέρα[ι]ς τριάκοντα, πρὸς τὸν μεσιτεύοντα δῆμον, καὶ ἐν ἄλλαις ἡμέραις πέντε κληρωσά-
τωσαν τὸν κρινοῦντα δῆμον, μετὰ δὲ τὸν κλῆρον ἐν ἄλλαις ἡμέραις ἑξήκοντα παραγενόμε-
νοι πρὸς τὸν εἰληχότα δῆμον διαδικαζέσθωσαν, φέροντες παρὰ τῶν ἰδίων πατρίδων
γράμματα πρὸς τὴν εἰληχεῖαν πόλιν ὑπὲρ τῆς δόσ[ε]ως τοῦ δικαστηρίου, καὶ τὸ κατακριθὲν
πρασσέτωσαν παραχρῆμα· ἐὰν δέ τις μὴ παραγ[έ]νηται ἢ ἐπὶ τὸν μεσιτεύοντα δῆμον
ἢ ἐπὶ τὴν λαχοῦσαν πόλιν, ἔστω κατὰ τὸν [π]αρόντα. ταῦτα δὲ ὑπάρχειν Σαρδιανοῖς κα[ὶ]
Ἐφεσίοις εἰς τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον, καὶ ἐάν τι αἱ πόλεις οἰκειότερον βουλεύ-
σωνται. ἀνα-
γράψαι δὲ καὶ εἰς στήλας λιθίνας τήνδε τὴν συνθήκην καὶ στῆσαι ἐν μὲν Ἐφέσωι ἐν
τῶι τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος ἱερῶι ἐν τῶι ἐπισημωτάτωι τόπωι, ἐν δὲ Σάρδεσιν ἐν τῶι τοῦ Διὸς ἱερῷ[ι]
ἐν τῶι ἐπισημωτάτωι τόπωι, ἐν δὲ Περγάμωι ὃν ἂν αἰτήσωνται κατὰ κοινὸν αἱ πόλεις ἐπιση[μό]-
τατον τόπον. εἶναι δὲ τὴν συνθήκην κυρίαν, ὡς μὲν Ἐφέσιοι ἄγουσιν ἀπὸ πρυτάνεως Σελεύκου, ἱερέ[ως]
δὲ τῆς Ῥώμης Ἀρτεμιδώρου, μηνὸς Ταυρεῶνος τετράδος ἀπιόντος, ὡς δὲ Σαρδιανοὶ ἐπὶ ἱερέω[ς]
τῆς μὲν Ῥώμης Σωκράτου, τοῦ δὲ Διὸς τοῦ Πολιέως Ἀλκαίου, μηνὸς Δαισίου τετράδος ἀπιόντος.
εἰσὶν δὲ οἱ ὑφ' ἑκατέρων τῶν δήμων ἀποδειχθέντες ἄνδρες ἐπὶ τῶν συλλύσεων Σαρδιανῶν
μὲν Μενεκράτης Διοδώρου, Φοῖνιξ Φοίνικος, Ἀρχέλαος Θεοφίλου, Ἐφεσίων δὲ Ἱκέσιος Ἀρτεμιδώ-
ρου, Ποσειδώνιος Ποσειδωνίου τοῦ Διονυσίου, Ἀριστογείτων Πάτρωνος, Ἀρτεμίδωρος

40 Ἀ(ρ)τεμ(ι)δώρου, Μενεκράτης Μενεκράτου τοῦ Ἀρτεμιδώρου, Ἀπολλόδω-
ρος Ἑρμοκράτου,
Ἑρμιππος Μενοίτου.

2–3: δ[ί|κας]: Dittenberger. || 11: [συνδια]cώζειν: Dittenberger. [διανα]cώζειν: Fränkel. || 12: ΟΠΑΑ. || 40: ΑΤΕΜΔΩΡΟΥ.

This case is one quite typical of the later second and the first centuries. By the 90s B.C. Roman influence and authority was well established in the East, far more than it had been a century before. Earlier in the second century, it was common for the Greek states to turn to Rome voluntarily and request that it arbitrate their quarrels. But as time went on, and the Romans assumed the power and the obligations in the eastern Mediterranean previously experienced by the Hellenistic kings, they also began to concern themselves more with the relationships of the Greek states. Here, the Roman proconsul in Asia, the highly respected Mucius Scaevola, urged the states of Ephesos and Sardis to submit their enmity and quarrel (II, line 11) to reconciliation and the mediation of a third party.[1] It is interesting to note, however, that even if Roman involvement in Greek affairs increased dramatically after (for example) the formation of the province of Asia, it was still a common policy to pass the actual work of arbitration along to another Greek state. Scaevola's letters do not inform us who was to mediate the settlement between Ephesos and Sardis. Indeed, his words appear to suggest that he would carry out the mediation himself. But the fuller text of the treaty informs us that there was a μεcιτεύουcα πόλιc involved in the negotiations, and all the evidence points to Pergamon as the city that helped the Ephesian and Sardian representatives reach an agreement.

The surviving terms of the treaty are reminiscent of other interstate treaties including clauses of isopolity or interchange of juridical rights. Regulations were laid down concerning citizens taking up political rights in the other city; suits for damages were to be tried in the defendant's city; and provisions were apparently made for private lawsuits that might have to be referred to a third neutral party (IV, lines 2–3). Of immediate relevance in the current context are the clauses that refer to future arbitration (IV, lines 18–29). If either of the two parties to the treaty should violate any of its terms, then the injured party had the right

1. The terms used in Scaevola's letters and in the treaty (cύλλυcιc, μεcιτεύειν) suggest that the third-party negotiations behind the treaty itself were probably friendly and mediatory rather than strictly arbitral.

The date of this treaty is still undetermined. Will (II, p. 463) and Magie (*Buckler Studies,* p. 177) support a date of 94/3 for Scaevola's governorship. Dittenberger (*OGIS* 437), Broughton (vol. 2, pp. 5–6), Raeder (80), Kallet-Marx (*CPh* 84 [1989] pp. 305–12), and Marshall (*Athenaeum* 54 [1976] pp. 117–30) support an earlier date (98/7), before Scaevola's consulship (95). It should also be pointed out that Rigsby argues for a rearrangement of these fragments that would remove the letters of Scaevola from the treaty; in Rigsby's view, therefore, Scaevola was not necessarily involved in the agreement between Ephesos and Sardis.

to institute judicial proceedings before a neutral court from a third city. The provisions for the choice of the arbitrating city are interesting. Rather than choose once and for all a state that would carry out all future arbitrations for them, the Ephesians and Sardians decided that they preferred a system whereby a choice could be made from among a number of states. This would obviate the problem of a potential deterioration of relations between either Ephesos or Sardis and the arbitrating state. Once the two had decided on a limited number of different states that could perform the task, the final choice of the one city that was to be arbitrator was to be made by lot. Even here there were provisions for fair play and justice. The allotment was to be carried out by Pergamon, the state that had mediated the treaty.

Although the terms of the treaty do not say so explicitly, Ephesos and Sardis may have intended that arbitration be the last in a series of attempts to adjust problems. Prior to going to arbitration, the state that felt itself to be wronged was to send an embassy to the allegedly guilty party, communicating its grievance publicly. This might offer an opportunity to both sides to negotiate informally. Within thirty days of this announcement, both states were to send representatives to the mediating city, Pergamon, for the purpose of seeking an arbitral settlement. Although the mediating state's role is specifically stated to be that of facilitating the allotment of an *arbitrating* state, within a five-day time limit from the appearance of the Ephesian and Sardian representatives, these five days might offer yet another opportunity for reaching a mutually agreeable settlement. The final step, once the arbitrator had been chosen, was for the disputants to send their representatives within sixty days, bearing statements from their home states that their jurisdiction was acceptable. The arbitration was then to occur at once. If either party failed to appear, either in the mediating state or in the arbitrating state, then they would lose by default.

It seems possible, then, that future mediation by Pergamon between Sardis and Ephesos was envisioned; perhaps arbitration would be employed only if absolutely necessary. Certainly there are numerous examples of arbitrators who regarded mediation as their primary duty and delivered a strict judicial sentence only when all else failed.[2] The establishment of a "pool" of arbitrating states from which one might be chosen by lot has some precedent.[3] But the double procedure of employing the services of a neutral state (Pergamon) to choose another neutral state for an arbitrator appears to be unique.[4]

2. Cf. **74**, **137**.

3. Cf. **92** and **9** Appendix.

4. In arbitrations involving federal states it was of course often a two-step process, whereby two litigant states would apply to the *koinon*, which would then designate a third state to carry out the arbitration; cf. **3**, **38**. But this situation is not fully analogous to the Ephesos-Sardis-Pergamon agreement; neither is the Roman practice of delegation of requests for arbitration.

171. Erythrai and Sardis try to arbitrate between Miletos and Priene (c. 91/0)

Three documents from the north stoa in the agora at Priene.

I: Decree for Krates. Numerous fragments. Only the relevant portion (lines 1–151) is cited.

*Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene* 111 (q.v. for epigraphic details).

II: Honorary decree. H: 0.475 m; w: 0.685 m; d: 0.26 m.

*Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene* 120.

III: Honorary decree. H: 0.455 m; w: 0.615 m; d: 0.26 m.

*Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene* 121.

Tod 68 (I), 69 (II); L. Robert, *RA* 24 (1926) p. 181; *SEG* IV.493; Magie, *RRAM*, vol. 1, pp. 167–68; vol. 2, p. 1057; Robert, *REG* 1966, 272; id., *REG* 1969, 514; Sherwin-White, p. 236.

I: Decree for Krates

[section missing]

- . . ι ἀπῆ̣ς̣α̣ν . ω̣ . . . . . Ι̣ ωρων
[- ἀποδ]οχῆς δυσελπίστως τε παν-
- τόποις ἐπ' αἰτίαι τῆς ἐργασίας
[- πα]ρὰ Ῥωμαίοις μέγα τι τὴν νο-
- -νον ἀπὸ τῆς ἐξουσίας ὑφο-
[ρᾶσθαι? - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]τά τε παγέντα σημεῖα ἤρεν
- -σουσαν ἐπιστροφὴν ἐκ τοῦ
[- τοῦ π]ερὶ αὐτὸν φρονήματος οὔτε
[- o]ὐδὲ ἐν οἷς ἐθεώρει τὸν κίνδυ-
[νον -] καὶ εἰ δέοι τι πάσχειν δεινὸν
[- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - τῆς κατὰ τῶν τ]όπων κυριείας, ἐξ ὧν τὸ μὲν
[- π]ρεσβείας ὡς ἐναντία πέπραχ-
[ται - ἡ]γησαμένων ἀδίκους μεθ' ὃ
- πρὸς Γάιον Ἰούλιον Γαΐου υἱὸν καὶ
[- ἀποδ]ημήσας εἰς Πέργαμον ἐποιήσατο
- ὥστε τὸν ἀνθύπατον ἐπιτάξαι
- ἐπόνησαν· ἐπὶ δὲ στεφανηφό-
[ρου -]ν συντελεσθέντων ὑπ' αὐτῶν
[- - - - - - - - - - - - ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ δεῖνος στε]φανηφόρου μηνὸς Ληναιῶνος
[- τ]ὸ ἱκανὸν περὶ τῆς οἰκοδομίας
[- στρ]ατηγοῦ Γαΐου Ἰουλίου Γαΐου υἱοῦ
[- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - καὶ ταύτην τὴν π]ρεσβείαν ἐτέλεσεν δωρεὰν
[- χειροτονη]θεὶς καὶ αὐτὸς πρεσβευτὴς

[- δ]ικαστῶν καὶ τῆς ἐπὶ τοὺς τό-
[πους - - - - - - - - - - - - ἐτέλεσε καὶ ταύτην] τὴν πρεσβείαν δωρεάν, τῆς τε
[- ἀποδ]ειχθεὶς καὶ αὐτὸς ἔγδικος εἰς
[- - - - - 24 - - - - - - ἐχειρότονησεν αὐτὸν ὁ δῆ]μος εἰς τὴν δευτέραν ἐξάμη-
[νον -] πεφροντισμένως τό τε τῆς
[- κ]αὶ δίκαιον προστάντων ἑαυ-
[τ- ἐν τ]ῶι τῆς ἀρχῆς αὐτοῦ χρόνωι
- -αντας παρεμισθώσατο τὴν ἐπι
[- - - - - - - - - - - - - - εἰς Λαοδίκειαν? τὴν ἐπὶ τ]ῶι Λύκωι, οὗ διὰ τὴν
περιοῦσαν
[- θεωρὸς γε]νόμ[ε]νος [δ]ᾳπάνην [πρ]ὸ[ς]

[three blocks missing]

[- - 16 - - δ π]ρότερο[ν] εἰργάζετο βασιλεὺς Ἄτταλος, οὔτε διακατέχει ὁ δῆμος ἡμῶν οὔτε
[ἡ σύγκλητος ἐξουσίαν οὐ]δεμίαν εἰς τοὺς δημοσιώνας πεποίηται· τὰς δὲ κατασκευασθείσας ὑφ' ἑαυ-
[τοῦ ἁλέας τὰς ἀνακειμέ]νας ἐκ πλείονος χρόνου τῆι Ἀθηνᾶι τῆι Πολιάδι, ἃς κατέχει καὶ καρπίζεται
[ὁ δῆμος, ἀνέςωςεν, π]αρακαλῶν τὸν ἀνθύπατον τοῖς μὲν ὑπὸ τῶν ἁλωνῶν λεγομένοις μὴ προς-
[τίθεσθαι, ἀλλὰ ἐφίεσθ]αι τῶι δήμωι τὰ πράγματα, μέχρι ἂν ἐπιγνῶμεν τὸ χριθησόμενον ὑπὲρ
[αὐτῶν ὑπὸ τῆς συγκ]λήτου, ἔπειςέν τε τὸν ἀνθύπατον καὶ αὐτὸς ἀποφήνασθαι, ὅτι οἴεται δεῖν δια-
[τηρεῖν τοὺς κατεχομέν]ους ὑφ' ἡμῶν· πάλιν τε τῶν δημοσιωνῶν βιασαμένων κα⟨ὶ⟩ προσαγαγόν-
[των - - - 14 - - - -]ᾳν τῶι στρατηγῶι καὶ οἰομένων δεῖν διδόν[αι] τὸ ἱκανὸν ἕως οὗ γένητ[αί τι ἀ[πό]-
[κριμα τῆς συγκλήτου], αὐτὸς ὑπὲρ τῆς πατρίδος δι[αθ]έμενος . . . . . καὶ τῆι προσεδ[ρ]είαι ΙΛ . . .
. . . . . ᾳ̣ι̣σας -
[δι]ᾳ̣ [τ]ῆ̣ς ἰδίας κρίσεως πᾶσαν ἀναδεξάμενος καὶ ᾳ̣ὐ̣[τὸς - - - - - - - - - - - -]
[. . πρ]ᾴ̣γματα· ἐπὶ δὲ στεφανηφόρου Σωσικράτου [c]υν - - - - - - - - - - - - λῃ .
c . . ᾳ̣, περὶ ὧν ἐδογμάτισεν ἡ σύγκλητος τῶν τε πᾰ́γ̣[των? - - - - - - - - - - - -] χρ̣́ονον, ἀ[πο]-
δεδειγμένος καὶ αὐτὸς ἔκδικος, καὶ συνεσκεύᾳ̣[σεν - - - - - - - - - - - - ἀποδημ]ή̣σας εἰς
Ἐρυθρὰς εἰσηνέγκατο τὴν πᾶσαν ἐπιμέλειαν κα[ὶ - - - - - - - - - - - - δικαιο]λο-
γήσας ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως ἐν τῶι θεάτρωι τῶι Ἐρυθραίων κ/ . . ς . . . . . ν [ἀ]νδρῶν, [συ]νπα-
ρόντος καὶ ἄ⟨λ⟩λου πλήθους ἱκανοῦ καὶ τὸ μάλιστα νῃ[- - - - 16 - - - - τὸ ἀμφισβήτημ]α τὸ κατὰ [τὸ]ν
εἴσπλουν συνκατ[ώ]ρθωσεν μετὰ τῶν συνεκδίκων [- - - - - - - - - - - - - συ]νῃ[σ]θέν[τες τοῖς]

γεγονόσιν εὐημερήμασιν· ἑαυτοῖς ἐκ τῆς κρίσεω[c - - - - 16 - - - -]μεια [. . . τ]ὰ ὅ[λα ἐτή]-
ρησεν τῆς πόλεως δίκαια· κομισάμενος δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς [τῆι π]ατρ[ίδι τ]ὰ κρίμ[ατα τήν τε ἄδει]αν?
εἰς τὴν πόλιν μετὰ τῶν συναποδεδειγμένων ἑ[αυτῷ πρεσβευτῶν . . . . . κ]α[ταστήσας] δὲ καὶ τὴν
πόλιν ἀδάπανον καὶ τῶν εἰς τὰς ἰδίας παρασκευὰς [ἀναλωμάτων, δαπανήσ]ας καὶ εἰς ταῦτα παρ'
αὐτοῦ· διὰ παντὸς δὲ τῶν δημοσιωνῶν - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -μ[α]σιν? τῶν . . . . αν . . . .
ἡμῶν καὶ καταπειραζόντων ἀεί ποτε τοὺ[c] εἰς Ἀσίαν ἐ[στ]α[λμένους στ]ρα-[τ]ηγούς, ἐντυ[χ]όντων δὲ καὶ
τῶι στρατηγῶι Λευκίωι Λευ[κ]ιλίωι Λευκίου [υἱ]ῶ[ι - - - 15 - - - -]ου[c] τοὺς . . . . . ου . . ο . . . αὐ-
τὸς τοῖς πρεσβεύουσιν πα[ρ' ἡμῶν] πρὸς α[ὐτὸν - - - 12 - - -] αὐτὸν π[ρ]οσε . . . . σε φ . . . . περὶ τῶν
ἀλεῶν, ὧν ἐνεκάλουν κ[- - - - - - - - 35 - - - - - - - - - τ]ῆς πρὸς τὴν πατρίδα, καὶ ἀποδημήσας εἰς Ἔφεσον - - - - - - 19 - - - - - - -ς[. . . . . μ]ηδὲν ἐπιβαλλόντων ἑαυ-
τοῖς τόπ[ω]ν οἱ δημοσιῶναι [- - - 13 - - - πρεσβ]είαν τοῦ δήμου [πρὸς τ]ὴν σύγκλητον ἀπεσταλ[κ]ό-
τος περὶ τῶν ἀλεῶν, αἳ καὶ ἑκάστο[υ . . . . . κ]αὶ τῶ[ν . . . . .] τὰ π[ρά]γ[μ]ατα, μέχρι ἂν ἡ σύγκλητος
[π]ερὶ αὐτῶν διαλάβῃ, οἷς καὶ περι[θέντος το[ῦ] στ[ρ]ατηγοῦ . . ν . . η . . η . θη καὶ τῶι δήμωι τὰ πρα[χ]-
[θέν]τα ἀκέραια, τὴν δὲ ΓεΓ . . . . . τε . ν . . . . . αν· ἐπὶ δὲ στεφανη[φ]όρ[ο]υ Ἀκρισίου τῆς πρὸς Μιλησίου[c]
ἡμῖν κρίσεως ἐνστάσης τῆς ἐπὶ [το]ῦ . . . . . ρου, ἀποδε[ι]χθεὶς καὶ [αὐτὸς ἔκδικος ἀπεδ]ήμησεν [μ]ε[τὰ τῶν συν]-
[κ]εχειροτονημένων, καὶ τῆς μὲν ἡμετέρας πόλεως βουλο[μένης κρίνεσθ]α⟨ι⟩ περ[ὶ] ὧν ἦν [ἡ διαφορά],
περὶ δὲ ὧν ἤμεν προκεκριμένο[ι ὑπ'] Ἐρυθραίων καὶ γε[ν]ικήκ[αμ]ε[ν τὸ ζήτημα τὸ κατ]ὰ τὸν εἴσπλουν . . . . . .
[τ]οις ἐπικοινωνούντων, καὶ περὶ ὧν ὁ στρατηγὸς Λεύκιος Λε[υκίλιος ἔγραψεν] καὶ ἀνέπεμψεν [πρὸς τὴν]
[c]ύγκλητον, καθότι καὶ τὸ ψήφισμα περιέχει καὶ τῶν ΤΩΙΤΩΙΣ? - - - - - - -ν, ἀκέραια [ταῦτα πάντα ἀ]-
[φεθῆ]ναι [τ]ὰ πράγματα, καθότι ἦν δίκαιον· Μιλησίων δὲ καθ[όλου ἀξιούντ]ων κριθῆναι . . . . . .
[. . . . . δίκη]ν δὲ κενὴν θελόντων ἀποφέρεσθαι καὶ φαμ[ένων - - 10 - - κρ]ιθῆναι περὶ πάν[των . . .]
. . . . . ον ἢ ἄλλως μὴ κ[ρι]θήσεσθαι, καὶ παρακαλού[ντων - - - - - - - - - - -] μὴ ἴσου . . . . . .
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

4: [πρὸς τοὺς δυναμένους πα]ρὰ Ῥωμαίοις: Hiller von Gaertringen. || 32: [στεφανηφόρ?]ωι Λύκωι: Fredrich *ap. IPriene.* || 120: αὐτὸς ὑπὲρ τῆς πατρίδος δι[αθ]έμενος [λόγους]: Robert. || 144: [διαφό]ρου: Hiller von Gaertringen ("schwerlich"). || 148: τῶν τ̣ο̣[ύ]τ̣ο̣ις [ἐπικοινωνούντω]ν?: Hiller von Gaertringen.

II: Honorary decree

- -
- -
- -
[- - - - - - - - - - καὶ ἐμ πρυτα]νείωι vacat
- - - - - - - - - - - - -χων τῆς καλλίς-
- - - - - - - - - - - - -των ἐπιγνοὺς
[- - - - - - - - - - - κ]ε̣κοινωνηκόσιν
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -Λ . . . ΙΣ- - -
- -
- -
- -
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

- - - - - - - - ὑπεδέξατο - - -
- - - - - - - ἔδωκεν εἰς τὸ γρα-
- - - - - - - -c ἕως Ληναιῶνος
- - - - - - - -πατριος . . . . oc
- - - - - - - -ας πᾶσαν εἰσηνεγ-
- - - - - - - - - - οὐδὲν ἐκλεί-
- - - - - - - -ῳ ἐπὶ Τριπόλεως
- - - - - - - - - -υνας ως τη
[- - - - - - - - - - κ]αὶ δαπά-
- - - - - - - - - - -υ . . π . ι
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
- -
- -cαcη- - -
ὑπὲρ ἀνα- - - - 12 - - - -ν πρὸς τ[ούς τε ἀπεσταλμέν]ους εἰς τὴν
Ἀσίαν ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων στρατηγοὺς Γάϊον τε Λαβέωνα καὶ Λεύκιον Πείσωνα
καὶ Μᾶρκον Ὑψαῖον κ⟨αὶ Μ⟩ᾶρκον Σιλανὸν Μυρένα{ν}ταμίαν καὶ πρὸς
ἄλλους
Ῥωμαίους· πρεσβεύσας δὲ καὶ πρὸς Μιλησίους πολλάκις ὑπὲρ τῶν συν-
στάντων τῇ πόλει πραγμάτων καὶ πρὸς Μάγνητας ὁμοίως, ἔτι δὲ πρὸς Σαμίους
ὑπέρ τε τῶν κατὰ τὴν χώραν καὶ τὴν ἐξαίτησιν τῶν ἀνδροφόνων, πρός τε
Τραλλιανοὺς ὑπὲρ τῶν συνστάντων τῇ πόλει πραγμάτων {πόλει πραγμά-
των}πολλάκις πρεσβεύσας καὶ οὐθεμίαν οὐδέποτε κακοπαθίαν ἐκκλίνων·
ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ πρὸς Ἀλεξανδρεῖς τοὺς ἐν τῇ Τρωιάδι καὶ πρὸς Ἐφεσίους καὶ
Μυ-
λασεῖς καὶ πρὸς Ἐρυθραίους δὲ ὑπὲρ τῶν πρὸς Μιλησίους καὶ πρὸς Σαρδια-
ν[οὺς]
ὁμοίως καὶ πρὸς Κολοφωνίους ὑπὲρ τῶν . . . . πρὸς Μάγνητας πλεονάκις
καὶ πρὸς Σέλευκον τὸν βασιλέως Ἀντιόχου τοῦ ἐγ βασιλέως Δημητρί[ου]
κα[ὶ π]ρὸς Ἀλαβανδεῖς, πρὸς δὲ Γάιον Ἐγνάτ[ιον συν]αποσταλεὶς δικαστ[ὴς]
το . . . . . ε̣λ̣ . . . . . χρε̣[ίαν ἐ]τέλεσεν τῶι δήμωι χωρὶς ὀψωνίων̣
ων- - - - - 18 - - - - -νεις [ὑπὲρ τ]ῶν τῆι πατρίδι χρησίμων I
- - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - -
- - - -πι̣- - - -
- - - -χ- - - -
- - - -c̣- - - -
- - - -ο- - - -
- - - - - - - - -

10–11: εἰσηνέγ|[κατο]: Hiller von Gaertringen. || 14–15: δαπά|[νας?]: Hiller von Gaertringen. || 23: ΚΑΡΚΟΝ. || 34: τ[ὴν μὲν καθ'] ἑα[υτὸν] χρε[ίαν ἐ]τέλεσεν: Hiller von Gaertringen *add.* to *IPriene* 121.

The agora at Priene, like the temple of Athena Polias in the same state, was home to a variety of important public inscriptions. The group collected here consists of honorary decrees for certain individuals, decrees that provide evidence for a dispute between Priene and Miletos. The two had clashed in the past and had gone to arbitration, with the help of Smyrna, and perhaps Rome (**100**). They had also concluded an agreement intended to regulate lawsuits between individual citizens of the two states.[1] But around the beginning of the first century B.C. Miletos and Priene were having troubles again.[2]

The first document in this group is an extremely lengthy honorary decree for Krates, a citizen of Priene. Krates had performed a number of services for the state, which are listed in this inscription. The first thirty or so lines of the inscription offer no continuous sense, but they do speak of Krates acting as an ambassador and advocate of the state, making representations to the Roman power in the region, C. Julius Caesar.[3] Some question regarding land appears to be involved. A dispute seems to have arisen over resources, specifically the saltworks that were located at the estuary of the Gaisonis marsh.[4] The Prienians claimed these saltworks, declaring that they were traditionally the property of the goddess, Athena Polias. Roman *publicani* and salt contractors, in the wake of the formation of the province of Asia and the Gracchan reforms, appear to have had pretensions to the revenues from the territory.[5] Krates persuaded the Roman proconsul to resist the claims of the *publicani* until the matter had been laid before the senate for a decision. When the senate responded by passing on the arbitration to the Greek state of Erythrai, Krates acted as advocate for his own city, travelling to Erythrai and putting forth the legal arguments of Priene. This occurred during the stephanephorate of Sosikrates.

In the stephanephorate of Akrisios, perhaps the following year, another arbitration took place, this time between Priene and Miletos but apparently over the same issue. Krates again acted as the Prienian advocate, although he was accompanied, as before, by other Prienian representatives. In the context of this trial, the inscription states that the Prienians had already undergone an Erythraian arbitration and had had their own claims supported. They may be referring to a general ruling in the arbitration during the stephanephorate of

1. *IPriene* 28, perhaps concluded as a result of the earlier Smyrnaian arbitration.

2. On the date of this dispute with Miletos, and the inscriptions that provide the evidence for it, see *IPriene*, pp. 219–20. A date in the late 90s seems most probable.

3. The father of the famous Caesar, active in Asia between 92 and 90 (Broughton, vol. 2, p. 22; vol. 3, p. 105). Lucius Lucilius (lines 136, 147) may have been the governor of Asia in 90 (Broughton, vol. 2, p. 27).

4. Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene*, p. 98.

5. A great deal of tension in the Greek East under Roman jurisdiction was created by the presence of the *publicani*. Appeals to the senate were not uncommon, and the senators did not always uphold the interests of their own countrymen, as an arbitration between the state of Pergamon and the *publicani* attests (*IGRR* IV.262; Sherk 12; Sherk, *TDGR* 45).

Sosikrates, to the effect that the Prienians held the rights to the saltworks; or it may be that the Milesians were also involved in that earlier arbitration, although it is the *publicani* who seem to be most closely associated with it.

The Prienian inscription claims that the Milesians were on the whole agreeable to the notion of going to arbitration; nevertheless, the δίκη is referred to as κενή. In document II, the Prienians complain that the Milesians slipped their obligations and shirked a trial. In this inscription, which is a decree honouring an individual who acted as a Prienian advocate, we find that the trouble between Priene and Miletos had gone to Sardis for judgement. The Erythraian arbitration had evidently failed, and the senate had asked Sardis to perform the service. The comment that the Milesians have avoided a judicial settlement not once but twice (line 23) may refer to the failure of the Erythraian arbitration and a failed Sardian arbitration. At that point the senate may have decided to reject any future claims that the Milesians might make, since they were not acting in good faith.

The third document is also an honorary decree, thanking an individual who had frequently acted as an ambassador, not only to the Romans and to the Seleukid king Seleukos VI but also to various Greek neighbours of Priene. Among them were the Milesians, whom our unknown ambassador visited in the context of certain problems separating Miletos and Priene. Since he is also said to have visited Erythrai and Sardis in the context of these same problems, it is more than likely that the inscription refers to the Priene-Miletos dispute, perhaps over the saltworks, perhaps over other matters also, which was arbitrated unsuccessfully by Erythrai and Sardis. The phrasing of document III suggests that Priene may also have had disputes with Magnesia and Tralles, since they are spoken of in the same way as Miletos. The ambassador is said to have visited Kolophon in an effort to deal with the Magnesian situation just as he is said to have visited Erythrai to deal with the Milesian problem. This might suggest that Kolophon, like Erythrai, had tried to arbitrate Priene's relations with one of its neighbours.[6]

6. This inscription also informs us that Priene and Samos clearly still had problems. The ambassador visited Samos in order to pursue a couple of Prienian concerns, a demand for the extradition of certain murderers and a territorial question.

Appendix

APPENDIX:
RELATED CASES OF INTEREST

A variety of cases are offered here. The chief purpose of this appendix is to gather together those items that were thought by past scholars to be cases of international arbitration but that for different reasons have been excluded from this collection. Some have been excluded because it was determined that a particular inscription (or literary source) does not in fact represent a true instance of international arbitration or at least mediation. For example, cases of foreign judges have been included under the rubric of international arbitration in the past, but the criteria followed in the present collection rule out their inclusion, since foreign judges typically settled disputes within the confines of a single state. Nevertheless, it seemed useful to include a brief summary of the cases included by Tod, Raeder, and Berard; these have not formed independent cases in this work, either because they do not match the criteria mentioned or because they fall outside the temporal limits set. Sonne's cases are not all included here because half of his work was explicitly devoted to the study of *private* international disputes. Any incidents of arbitration that predate 337 were featured in Piccirilli's study and naturally do not appear here. The appendix does include some extremely fragmented inscriptions that may well refer to instances of international arbitration (as their editors argued) but are in such poor shape that we can say nothing about them for certain. In the interest of completeness, I felt it better to make some mention of these items here, rather than ignore them completely. I have also included some other items because they offer relevant comparative material.

TREATIES (CHIEFLY *SYMBOLA*)

1. Judicial treaty between Cretan Biannos and an unknown state?

A mutilated inscription from south Crete that may contain the remnants of a judicial treaty between two states. The editor conjectured that he had found an early use of the κοινοδίκιον, but there is no evidence for this. The two states may have agreed to use judicial process if disputes arose between them, but the inscription is too fragmented to allow for certainty.

Pappadakis, Ἀφιέρωμα εἰς Γ. Ν. Χατζιδάκην (Athens, 1921) pp. 72–77; *SEG* I.410; *IC* II.xxx.1; Schmitt 454.

2. *Symbolon* between Naxos and Arkesine

An inscription (c. 300 B.C.) that details a loan agreement between the state of Arkesine and a citizen of Naxos by the name of Praxikles also provides evidence that Naxos and Arkesine had a *symbolon* treaty, whereby matters of a judicial and commercial nature between their respective citizens could be settled in an ἔκκλητος πόλις. Any problems with the loan and its repayment were to be dealt with in accordance with the terms of the *symbolon.*

Sonne 57; Berard 29; *RIJG* I.15A; Hitzig 32; *IG* XII.7.67B; Raeder 37; *SIG*^{3} 955; Tarn, in Bury et al., *The Hellenistic Age* (Cambridge, 1923), pp. 109f.; Klaffenbach, *Festschrift für F. Zucker* (Berlin, 1954) pp. 214–26; *SEG* XIII.453; Gauthier, pp. 325f.; Migeotte, *AC* 46 (1977) pp. 128–39; *SEG* XXVII.548; Gauthier, *BCH* 104 (1980) pp. 197–205; *SEG* XXX.1086; Bagnall/Derow 60; Robert, *REG* 1981, 366.

3. Treaty between Athens and the Boiotian League, with Lamia as arbitrator

In the mid-third century B.C. (c. 244/3) Athens and the Boiotian League had a *symbolon* treaty with one another, a treaty that called for Lamia to function as the ἔκκλητος πόλις if the need arose; this treaty was invoked at least once in later years, sometime around the end of the third century.

Sonne 55; Berard 19; Raeder 38; *IG* II^2 778–79, 861; *SIG*^{3} 464–65; Meritt, *Hesperia* 7 (1938) pp. 118–21, no. 23; *SEG* XXI.406; Schmitt 487; Gauthier, p. 172, no. XVIII; Klose, p. 110.

4. Judicial process between Alipheira and Heraia

An inscription from Olympia, dated to c. 200 B.C., seems to indicate that some kind of judicial process took place involving the states of Heraia and Alipheira. There is no way of knowing whether the process involved a third party as well, as

Tod thought; but the presence of the letters ΣΥΜΒ- at line 2 might indicate that this inscription refers to a *symbolon.*

IOlympia 48; Tod 10.

5. *Symbolon* between Gortyn and Kaudos

A number of the states of Crete concluded judicial treaties with one another in the early second century B.C. It is frequently difficult to tell whether such treaties provided for public arbitration between states; but it is clear that they provided for settlement of private disputes in the manner of a *symbolon.* Gortyn and the community of Kaudos had a *symbolon* treaty that bears certain resemblances to the treaty between Hierapytna and Priansos (**67**) but appears to be more clearly restricted to the settlement of private disputes.

Halbherr, *AJA* 1 (1897) pp. 232f., no. 37; *SGDI* 5022; Guarducci, *RFC* 8 (1930) pp. 471f.; de Sanctis, *RFC* 8 (1930) pp. 483f.; Guarducci, *RFC* 11 (1933) pp. 488f.; id., *RFC* 14 (1936) pp. 362f.; Larsen, *CPh* 31 (1936) pp. 14f., 20f.; *IC* IV.184; Davaras, *AD* 18.1 (1963) pp. 141f., no. 1; Robert, *REG* 1966, 355; *SEG* XXIII.589; Gauthier, p. 328; Robert, *REG* 1976, 554; Vélissaropoulos, *Les nauclères grecs* (Paris, 1980) pp. 158–60, 206; Bile, *Le dialecte crétois ancien* (Paris, 1988) 38.

6. *Symbolon* between Gortyn, Hierapytna, and Priansos

A *symbolon* was concluded between the three states of Gortyn, Hierapytna, and Priansos (cf. **67**). This *symbolon* also makes provision for the judicial settlement of future private disputes; no certain conclusions can be drawn regarding the possibility of arbitration to settle public conflicts.

Scrinzi, *AIV* 55.2 (1897–98) pp. 157of.; Hitzig 45; *SGDI* 5024; Muttelsee, p. 61; Guarducci, *Epigraphica* 2 (1940) pp. 150f., 165f.; van Effenterre, p. 142; *IC* IV.174; Gauthier, p. 321.

7. *Symbolon* between the Magnesian and the Perrhaibian leagues

From an inscription of the latter part of the second century it appears that the Magnesians and Perrhaibians had a *symbolon* treaty with one another. The inscription is an honorary decree for judges sent in accordance with that treaty.

IG IX.2.1106; Raeder 64; Gauthier, pp. 340–43.

FOREIGN JUDGES

8. Judges from several states settle suits at Ilion

A third-century inscription from Ilion honouring judges from five other states (Rhodes, Delos, Paros, Kos, and one other) was thought by several scholars in the past to refer to a public arbitration between Ilion and one or several

of its neighbours. The terminology employed, however, clearly points to the institution of foreign judges rather than arbitration.

CIG 3598; Sonne 25; Berard 34; Raeder 65; Tod 57; Robert, *REG* 1925, pp. 34–35; *SEG* IV.662; Robert, *REG* 1938, 338; L. Robert, *Opera minora selecta* (Amsterdam, 1969) pp. 80–86; *Ilion* 52.

9. Judges from Aigai, Miletos, and Samos settle disputes for Eresos and Methymna

The states of the Lesbian League in the first part of the second century had concluded a treaty with each other that called for arbitration between the members of the League (**92**). A series of texts from Miletos appears to be evidence for such arbitrations. The three states of Aigai, Miletos, and Samos all sent judges to settle some outstanding disputes separating Methymna and Eresos; the language of the decrees suggests that these disputes were private ones.

Milet I.3.152; Schwyzer 631; Robert, *REG* 1925, pp. 29–43; *SEG* IV.431; *IG* XII supp. 139; Gauthier, p. 344.

10. A judge from Assos in Alabanda and Mylasa

A brief inscription from Assos tells us that a stele was erected in honour of the judge Lanthes, a citizen of that state. No evidence survives to point to the nature of the disputes that Lanthes settled, but the most likely scenario is that he acted in the capacity of a foreign judge, rather than as an arbitrator in a public dispute between states.

Sterrett, *Papers of the American School at Athens* I (1882–83) p. 26, no. 9; Sonne 29; Berard 43; Raeder 67; Tod 72; *IAssos* (1976) 9.

11. Judges from Kierion settle disputes between Gonnoi and another state?

Two inscriptions of the second-century B.C. from Gonnoi suggest that judges from Kierion were called in to resolve conflicts involving Gonnoi. The fact that the inscriptions are dated according to the calendars of Gonnoi and another, unknown city led Helly to suggest that the Kierian judges were invited to settle intercity disputes rather than conflicts opposing the citizens of Gonnoi to one another. But there is no evidence that these disputes were anything other than private in nature.

Arvanitopoulos, *AE* 1911, pp. 143–44, nos. 81–82; id., *AE* 1912, p. 244; id., *AE* 1913, p. 101; Arvanitopoulou, *Polemon* 2 (1939) pp. 24–25, nos. 40–41; Helly, *Gonnoi*, vol. 1, p. 114; vol. 2, pp. 115–17, nos. 106–7.

12. Larisa sends judges to Akraipheia

Two decrees from the Boiotian city of Akraipheia (mid–second century?) speak of the dispatch of a tribunal from Larisa to settle outstanding disputes between Akraipheia and its neighbours. The language of these decrees suggests that the Larisan judges came to settle private disputes between citizens of Akraipheia and other Boiotian cities.

Holleaux, *BCH* 14 (1890) pp. 33f., nos. 11–12; *IG* VII.4130–31; Raeder 70; Tod 18–19; Gauthier, pp. 343–44.

13. Megara sends judges to Akraipheia

Around the middle of the second century the Boiotian city of Akraipheia solicited the aid of both Larisa (see above) and Megara in settling disputes with its neighbours. As was the case with the Larisan tribunal, the Megarians probably resolved outstanding suits between individuals, rather than conflicts of a larger nature.

Perdrizet, *BCH* 24 (1900) pp. 74–79; Raeder 71; Tod 20; Feyel, *BCH* 60 (1936) pp. 15f.

14. Judges from Hypata settle suits in Delphi

A Delphian decree from around 146 B.C. honours three judges from Hypata for settling some outstanding suits. It is most likely that this is a simple case of foreign judges settling internal matters for the Delphians, but Bourguet originally conjectured that there might be some connection with the sanctuary of Thermopylai (cf. *FDelphes* III.1.261) or the Euboian dispute discussed in **166**.

FDelphes III.1.260; Tod 24; *SEG* II.275.

15. Judges from Karystos in Alabanda

An inscription of the first century B.C. honouring judges from Karystos was thought by Berard to refer to the settlement of disputes between Alexandria Troas and another state. The inscription has been shown, however, to be a decree of Alabanda that conforms to the formulae for honouring foreign judges.

CIG 2152b; Sonne 38; Berard 33; Wilhelm, *AE* 1901, pp. 149–50; *IG* XII.9.4.

TERRITORIAL SETTLEMENTS

16. Boundary arbitration between Phigaleia and an unknown state?

A fragmented inscription (c. 260–230 B.C.) containing a boundary demarcation; te Riele thought it might have been the result of an arbitration, but there is no positive evidence in the extant portion of the inscription.

Te Riele, *BCH* 90 (1966) pp. 256–62, no. 5; Robert, *REG* 1967, 278; *SEG* XXIII.236; Dubois, *Recherches sur le dialecte arcadien* II (Louvain, 1988) pp. 265–68, no. 3.

17. Boundary delineation for Megalopolis?

A mutilated fragment of an inscription from the first half of the second century B.C., discovered at Olympia, contains a boundary demarcation. The editor restored the phrase κατὰ κρ[ίσιν] (line 7); but the reference to an arbitration remains completely speculative, as does the identification of one of the states involved as Megalopolis.

Eckstein, *VI Bericht über die Ausgrabungen in Olympia* 1953/4 *und* 1954/5 (Berlin, 1958) pp. 209–11; Mastrokostas, *AE* 1960, p. 140, no. 3; *SEG* XVII.195, XXII.343.

18. Boundary settlement between Ambrakia and Charadros

Around 166 B.C., when Ambrakia was engaged in settling the boundaries with some of its neighbours by means of arbitration (**131**, **132**), it also came to an agreement over its borders with Charadros. It is not impossible that some arbitration was involved here as well; however, there is no evidence in the extant inscription that points to anything other than a voluntary mutual agreement between Ambrakia and Charadros.

Cabanes/Andréou, *BCH* 109 (1985) pp. 499–544, 753–57; Habicht, *ZPE* 62 (1986) pp. 190–92; Gauthier, *REG* 1987, 265; Cabanes, *REG* 1987, 634; Charneux/Tréheux, *BCH* 112 (1988) pp. 359–73; Daverio Rocchi, pp. 109–14, no. 6; Gauthier, *REG* 1989, 265.

19. Boundary settlements between Mylasa and its neighbours?

Numerous inscriptions of the second century B.C. from Mylasa attest to border delimitations, but there is no evidence that these delimitations involved the work of a third party.

LeBas/Waddington 423–24, 427, 435; Sonne 42, 43; Judeich, *MDAI(A)* 15 (1890) pp. 265–66, no. 18; Tod 73, 74; Persson, *BCH* 46 (1922) pp. 405–7, nos. 9–10; *SEG* II.544–45; Robert/Flacelière, *REG* 1939, 366; Robert, *Hellenica* 2 (1946) pp. 137–38; Magie, *RRAM*, vol. 2, p. 965; *IMylasa* 251–60.

20. Settlement between two unknown states

A tiny fragment of an inscription of the second century B.C. preserved in the Asklepieion at Epidauros may refer to an arbitration between two of the states in the region. The inscription appears to have contained a boundary demarcation, but there is no definite indication of the involvement of a neutral party.

IG IV.929; *IG* IV^2 1.78; Peek, *ASAW* 60.2 (1969) p. 28.

21. Boundary arbitration involving Kallatis?

A very fragmentary inscription that contains the words νείχη and ὅροc and a reference to the state of Kallatis was conjectured by Sonne to be connected with a boundary arbitration. The state of the inscription rules out any decisive interpretation.

Jirecek, *AEM* 10 (1887) p. 190; Sonne 44; Tod 78.

22. Boundary dispute involving Trikka in Histiaiotis?

It has been conjectured that an inscription from Thessaly may record a decree on a boundary dispute (there is a possible reference to a κρῖμα), but the fragment offers virtually no positive evidence.

Kougeas, *AE* 1945–47, p. 108, no. 46; McDevitt, *Inscriptions from Thessaly* 183.

23. Boundary dispute between Gonnoi and Kondaia?

Arvanitopoulos argued that a fragmented inscription from Thessaly pertained to a boundary dispute between Gonnoi and Kondaia. There is too little of the inscription remaining, however, to support his conclusions.

Arvanitopoulos, *AE* 1913, pp. 51–52, no. 181; McDevitt, *Inscriptions from Thessaly* 546.

24. Ephesos delineates the boundary between Aigai and a neighbour?

A very small fragment of an inscription from Ephesos may be a border delineation between Aigai and a neighbour; the provenance of the inscription may suggest the involvement of Ephesos as an arbitrator (Robert). Once again, the remains are too scanty to support any definite conclusions.

BMus 526; Robert, *Études anatoliennes* (Paris, 1937) p. 75; *IEphesos* 1526.

25. The Thessalian League arbitrates between Kierion and Metropolis

The involvement of Roman magistrates in arbitration between the Greek states became standard in the imperial period. Tod records a boundary arbitration of the early first century A.D. between two states, Kierion and Metropolis, undertaken by the Thessalian *synedrion* at the request of C. Poppaeus Sabinus.

Sonne, pp. 41f.; *IG* IX.2.261; Tod 41.

RELIGIOUS JURISDICTION

In this category I have included some cases of mediation or arbitration that involve not two states, strictly speaking, but rather a polis and a religious sanctuary with some claim to independent status.

26. A judgement between Phthiotic Thebes and Halos?

A fragment of an early-third-century inscription. Giannopoulos and Robert thought it might deal with an arbitration between the two Thessalian states over sacred territory and the cult of Athena Itonia (cf. **153**), but there is no definite evidence for this.

Giannopoulos, *AE* 1932, pp. 19–21, no. 5; Robert, *BCH* 59 (1935) pp. 208–9.

27. Settlement of a dispute between Mylasa and the sanctuary at Labraunda

A series of inscriptions from the latter part of the third century B.C. is evidence for ongoing problems between the state of Mylasa and the sanctuary of Zeus at Labraunda, perhaps disputes over the sacred lands. Labraunda was more or less subordinate to Mylasa, and yet the religious administration of the sanctuary evidently dealt with the outside powers (Seleukos II, Philip V) who settled the problems in a fairly independent manner.

Crampa, *Labraunda* III.1.1, 5–7.

28. Halikarnassos and Telmissos consult an ἔκκλητος πόλις

Around the beginning of the second century B.C. the state of Halikarnassos and the neighbouring community of Telmissos, with its cult of Apollo, quarreled over Halikarnassos's infringement of Telmissos's ancestral rights. Telmissos was subordinate to Halikarnassos, and the courts in Halikarnassos dealt with some of the issues, but an ἔκκλητος πόλις may also have been consulted.

Hicks, *JHS* 14 (1894) pp. 377–80; Michel 459; Sahin/Engelmann, *ZPE* 34 (1979) p. 220, no. 7; Robert, *REG* 1979, 464.

ROYAL ARBITRATIONS

29. Antiochos II settles the boundaries of Aigai and a neighbour

A brief inscription from the borders of the state of Aigai tells us that those borders were fixed by an agent of Antiochos II (261–247 B.C.); but nothing in the inscription suggests that this delimitation was the result of a neutral arbitration between Aigai and a neighbour.

Herrmann, *Denkschriften Wien* 77.1 (1959) pp. 4–6, no. 2; Robert, *REG* 1960, 340; Robert, *Les villes d'Asie Mineure* (Paris, 1962) pp. 279–80; *SEG* XIX.720; Orth, *Königlicher Machtanspruch und städtische Freiheit* (Munich, 1977) p. 169; Allen, p. 18.

30. Antiochos III settles matters between Kyme and Ephesos?

This small fragment of an inscription of the third century B.C. is a letter of a King Antiochos, probably Antiochos III, to the Ephesians. Ephesos's neighbour Kyme had sent an embassy to Antiochos, perhaps to complain about the actions of the Ephesians. The inscription offers no real grounds for speculation, but some scholars have seen in it a possible royal settlement between Ephesos and Kyme.

BMus 485; *OGIS* 242; Meyer, *Grenzen*, pp. 82, 101; Tarn, *CAH* VII (1928) p. 874; Welles, *RC* 17; *IKyme* 3; *IEphesos* 1485.

FEDERAL ARBITRATIONS

31. An arbitration within the Achaian League?

An extremely fragmented inscription from Olympia was thought by Tod to refer to a possible arbitration within the Achaian League, perhaps between Dyme and another state, shortly after the formation of the League in 280. But the brief references to τῶν δαμι[οργῶν] (line 5) and [κρ]ιταί (line 13) do little to verify Tod's conjectures.

Dittenberger, *ArchZeit* 37 (1879) p. 126, no. 255; *IOlympia* 51; Tod 80.

MEDIATION OF TREATIES

32. Treaty between Lato and Hierapytna formulated through mediation?

An inscription bearing a treaty between Lato and Hierapytna (III/O B.C.), discovered at Lyttos. Its venue suggests that Lyttos may have had something to do with the formulation of the treaty (cf. **165**); while the venue by itself might be an insufficient indicator, certainly there is general evidence for mediation on Crete during these years (cf. **158**, **163**, **164**). But mediation or arbitration is not explicit within the text of the treaty itself.

Van Effenterre/Bougrat, Κρητικὰ Χρονικά 21 (1969) pp. 9–53; Robert, *REG* 1970, 466; Faure, Ἀμάλθεια 13 (1972) pp. 227–40; Garlan, *BCH* 100 (1976) pp. 303–4; *SEG* XXVI.1049; Bile, *Le dialecte crétois ancien* (Paris, 1988) 43; Chaniotis, *Ktema*, pp. 25f.

DISPUTES OF AN UNDETERMINED OR UNIQUE NATURE

33. Arbitration between Heraia and an unknown state?

Hiller von Gaertringen thought that an inscription of the third century B.C. from Arkadia documented an arbitration between an unknown Arkadian state and the state of Heraia. But this conjecture is insubstantial, based solely on the appearance of the words cυνδίκο[ιc]| [δ'] ἐν Ἡραίαι (lines 6–7).

IG V.2.415 and p. 104; Dubois, *Recherches sur le dialecte arcadien* II (Louvain, 1988) pp. 235–36.

34. Dispute between Erikinion and Phayttos

The fragments of this inscription of the early second century B.C. offer no continuous sense. There are references to the laws of Erikinion and Phayttos regarding the sale and purchase of real estate, but whether these laws were meant to apply to a quarrel between states or between individuals is impossible to say.

IG IX.2.487; Arvanitopoulos, *AE* 1912, p. 65; Raeder 49; Tod 42; Stählin, p. 28.

35. Phayttos arbitrates between the Thessalian League and Lamia?

An inscription of the second century B.C. from Thessaly was thought to be a record of an arbitration by judges from Phayttos between the Thessalian League and Lamia. The inscription certainly makes some reference to judicial activity, but it is far too fragmented to support this kind of speculation.

Lolling, *MDAI(A)* 8 (1883) p. 127; *IG* IX.2.488; Raeder 68; Tod 31; Stählin, p. 28.

36. Arbitration between two unknown states?

An extremely small fragment of an inscription from Olympia (second century B.C.?) may preserve the words κρίcιc and ὁμόνοια. Tod conjectured that the document referred to an arbitration.

IOlympia 49; Tod 79.

37. Arbitration between Thaumakoi and a neighbouring state?

An inscription of the second century B.C. found between Lamia and Thaumakoi refers to Lakedaimon and to the state of Thaumakoi. The inscription is very fragmentary, and Wilamowitz's suggestion that it concerned the dispatch of a body of Spartan judges is unwarranted. Nevertheless, Tod conjectured on these

grounds that Thaumakoi had a dispute with a neighbouring state, a dispute resolved by arbitration.

Jamot/Deschamps, *BCH* 15 (1891) p. 341; Jardé/Laurent, *BCH* 26 (1902) p. 344; *IG* IX.2.214; Tod 32.

38. Scipio Aemilianus and the Macedonian republics

In the context of his narrative of Roman efforts to recruit officers for the Celtiberian War (151–150 B.C.) Polybios states that Scipio Aemilianus had a personal invitation from the Macedonians to settle some of their internal problems. Raeder includes this as a case of international arbitration, but its qualifications as such are questionable.

Polyb. 35.4.10–11; Raeder 57.

39. A ritual arbitration between Athens and Sparta

According to N. D. Robertson, who has collected and interpreted a series of texts from the Hellenistic and Roman periods, some time after 146 B.C. Athens and Sparta began to practice a ritual dispute over the right of leadership in the procession at the Panhellenic festival of the Eleutheria. This "arbitration," which offered an opportunity for displays of oratory, continued every four years into the imperial period.

Robertson, *Hesperia* 55 (1986) pp. 88–102 (and the texts cited there, including *IG* II^2 2086, 2788, and 3189 *add.*).

40. Arbitration between unknown states?

A fragment of an inscription (second/first century B.C.) from Dimitsana (Arkadia) preserves a few words that may refer to a judicial settlement between two states: [δικ]αστάς; perhaps [σύ]νδικος; also ἑκατέρων, with perhaps [πόλεων?].

IG V.2.496.

Concordance

CONCORDANCE

The figures in the columns below refer to case numbers in the works cited.

Ager	*Berard*	*Sonne*	*Raeder*	*Tod*
1	–	–	–	–
2	–	–	–	–
3	30	54	29	47
4	–	–	32	–
5	–	–	–	–
6	–	–	–	–
7	–	–	–	–
8	–	–	–	–
9	–	–	–	–
10	–	–	–	–
11	–	–	–	–
12	40	14	–	–
13	36	62	30	–
14	–	–	–	–
15	–	–	–	–
16	–	–	–	21
17	–	–	39	17
18	–	–	–	–
19	–	–	–	46
20	–	–	–	–
21	41	60, 61	79	75, 76
22	–	–	–	–
23	–	–	–	–

continued

Ager	*Berard*	*Sonne*	*Raeder*	*Tod*
24	–	–	–	–
25	–	–	–	–
26	39	–	34	61
27	27	16	–	–
28	–	–	–	–
29	–	–	–	–
30	–	–	36	38
31	–	–	35	38
32	26	28	19	34
33	–	–	–	28
34	–	–	–	–
35	–	–	–	–
36	–	–	–	–
37	–	–	–	–
38	11	48	50	15
39	10	17	40	–
40	2	32, 40, 41	51	5, 6, 7
41	–	–	–	27
42	–	–	–	–
43	–	–	–	–
44	–	–	–	–
45	–	–	–	–
46	–	–	–	–
47	–	–	–	48
48	–	–	–	55
49	–	–	–	–
50	1	51, 53	28	1
51	–	–	–	–
52	–	–	–	–
53	–	–	–	–
54	–	–	–	–
55	–	–	42	37
56	25	–	41	35
57	–	–	–	–
58	–	–	–	–
59	–	–	–	–
60	–	–	–	–
61	–	–	–	–
62	–	–	–	–

continued

Ager	*Berard*	*Sonne*	*Raeder*	*Tod*
63	–	–	60	12
64	44	21	45	82
65	–	–	–	39
66	–	37	75	77
67	47	56	76	54
68	–	–	–	–
69	–	–	–	9
70	–	–	33	43
71	–	–	–	–
72	–	–	–	–
73	–	–	–	–
74	39	18	34	62
75	–	–	–	–
76	–	–	–	–
77	–	–	–	–
78	–	–	59	33
79	26	28	19	34
80	3	33	61	3
81	4	23	81	4
82	–	–	–	–
83	28	15, 59	31, 63	45
84	–	–	–	–
85	14, 23	24, 34	43, 62	16, 29
86	–	–	–	–
87	–	–	–	–
88	–	–	–	26
89	–	–	–	–
90	–	–	–	–
91	–	–	–	–
92	–	–	48	58
93	–	–	–	–
94	–	–	–	–
95	–	–	–	–
96	–	–	–	–
97	–	–	–	–
98	–	–	–	–
99	39	19	34	–
100	38	30	66	67
101	42	26, 96	58	71
102	–	–	–	–

continued

Ager	*Berard*	*Sonne*	*Raeder*	*Tod*
103	–	–	–	–
104	–	–	–	–
105	–	–	–	–
106	–	–	–	–
107	–	–	–	–
108	–	–	–	–
109	–	–	–	–
110	46	27	52	–
111	–	–	–	–
112	–	–	–	–
113	–	–	–	–
114	–	–	–	–
115	–	–	–	–
116	–	–	–	8
117	–	–	–	22, 23
118	–	–	54	44
119	–	–	–	–
120	–	–	73	66
121	–	–	–	–
122	–	–	–	–
123	–	–	–	–
124	–	–	–	–
125	24	22	69	30
126	–	–	–	25
127	–	–	44	49
128	–	–	–	50
129	–	–	–	–
130	–	–	–	–
131	–	–	53	81
132	–	–	–	–
133	–	–	–	–
134	–	–	–	–
135	5	49, 52	27	2
136	–	–	–	–
137	5	49, 52	27	2
138	–	–	47	13, 14
139	–	–	–	–
140	–	–	55	–
141	–	50	56	–
142	–	–	–	–

continued

Ager	*Berard*	*Sonne*	*Raeder*	*Tod*
143	–	–	–	–
144	–	–	–	–
145	–	–	–	–
146	35	–	46	59
147	–	–	–	–
148	–	–	–	–
149	–	–	–	–
150	1	51, 53	28	1
151	–	–	–	–
152	–	–	–	–
153	–	–	72	40
154	26	28	19	34
155	–	–	–	–
156	26	28	19	34
157	–	–	–	–
158	48	35	74	56
159	1	51	28	1
160	39	20	34	63, 64, 65
161	–	–	–	–
162	–	–	–	–
163	–	–	–	26
164	45	31	77, 78	52, 53
165	–	–	–	–
166	–	–	–	–
167	–	–	–	–
168	–	40	–	–
169	–	–	–	–
170	–	47	80	60
171	–	–	–	68, 69
1 App.	–	–	–	–
2 App.	29	57	37	–
3 App.	19	55	38	–
4 App.	–	–	–	10
5 App.	–	–	–	–
6 App.	–	–	–	–
7 App.	–	–	64	–
8 App.	34	25	65	57
9 App.	–	–	–	–
10 App.	43	29	67	72
11 App.	–	–	–	–

continued

Ager	*Berard*	*Sonne*	*Raeder*	*Tod*
12 App.	–	–	70	18, 19
13 App.	–	–	71	20
14 App.	–	–	–	24
15 App.	33	38	–	–
16 App.	–	–	–	–
17 App.	–	–	–	–
18 App.	–	–	–	–
19 App.	–	42, 43	–	73, 74
20 App.	–	–	–	–
21 App.	–	44	–	78
22 App.	–	–	–	–
23 App.	–	–	–	–
24 App.	–	–	–	–
25 App.	–	–	–	41
26 App.	–	–	–	–
27 App.	–	–	–	–
28 App.	–	–	–	–
29 App.	–	–	–	–
30 App.	–	–	–	–
31 App.	–	–	–	80
32 App.	–	–	–	–
33 App.	–	–	–	–
34 App.	–	–	49	42
35 App.	–	–	68	31
36 App.	–	–	–	79
37 App.	–	–	–	32
38 App.	–	–	57	–
39 App.	–	–	–	–
40 App.	–	–	–	–

Indices

INDEX I

LITERARY PASSAGES

Aelian *Varia historia*
frag. 47: **11**

Appian
Macedonica 3.1: **57**
Macedonica 4.2: **60**
Macedonica 9.6–7: **106**
Macedonica 17: **121**
Mithridatica 3: **142**
Mithridatica 6–7: **148**
Sicelica 1: **35**
Syriaca 2: **77**
Syriaca 11: **112**
Syriaca 66: **122**

Arrian *Anabasis*
1.27.4: **6**
7.15.4–5: **7**

Athenaios
273a: **155**

Cassius Dio
17.58–59: **57**
21.72: **147**

Diodoros
17.113.3: **7**
19.65.5: **10**
19.70.7: **9**
19.71.6–7: **10**
20.95.4–5: **12**
20.98.2–3: **12**
20.99.3: **12**
28.11: **72**
29.22.2: **114**
30.2: **121**, **122**
30.24: **121**
31.2.1–2: **122**
31.7.2: **134**
31.32: **143**
32.20: **148**
33.28b.3–4: **155**

Dionysios of Halikarnassos
19.9.2–4: **27**

Justin
30.3–31.1: **60**
32.4.8: **112**

Livy
9.14.1: **8**
27.30.3–4: **57**
28.7.13–14: **57**
31.2.3–4: **60**
32.8.9–16: **73**
32.10: **72**
32.27.1: **73**
33.29.7–12: **75**
33.34.5–11: **76**
33.39.1–4: **77**
33.40.3: **77**
35.32.6–7: **84**
35.32.12–14: **84**
35.33.4–7: **84**
35.45.2–8: **84**
36.31.9: **86**
37.6.4–5: **94**
37.7.3–4: **94**
37.60: **95**
38.3.6–7: **94**
38.9.3–4: **94**
38.10.1–4: **94**
38.32.3–10: **96**
38.38.16–17: **97**
38.39.5 and 7: **98**
38.39.17: **104**
39.22.8–9: **104**
39.24.5–6: **106**
39.24.13–25.7: **106**
39.25.16–26.4: **106**
39.26.14: **106**
39.29.1–2: **106**
39.33.1–4: **106**
39.46.6–9: **106**
39.48.2–4: **111**
39.51.1: **112**
39.53.10: **106**
40.2.6 and 8: **114**
40.20.1: **114**
41.6.8–12: **102**
42.46.3–4: **121**
44.14.5–13: **121**
44.15: **102**
44.19.6–14: **122**
44.24.6: **121**
44.25.5: **121**
44.29.7–8: **121**
44.35.4: **121**
45.3.3–8: **121**
45.12.3–7: **122**
45.20.1–2: **123**
45.34.10–14: **123**
Periocha 50: **148**

Memnon (*FGH* 434)
F13: **34**
F18.6–10: **93**

Pausanias
7.8.6: **106**
7.9.3–5: **111**
7.11.1–2: **135, 136**
7.11.4–5: **141**
7.12.3–5: **147**
7.12.8–9: **147**
7.13.2–3 and 5: **147**
7.14.1–4: **147**
7.14.7: **149**

Plutarch
Aratos 25.5: **39**
Demetrios 22.8: **12**
Flamininus 12.2–3: **76**
Flamininus 20.5: **112**
Kleomenes 4.1: **45**
Pyrrhos 16.4: **27**

Polybios
2.54.3: **45**
4.49.2: **49**
4.51.9–52.4: **51**

5.24.11–12: **53**
5.28.1–2: **53**
5.63.4–7: **52**
5.67.11: **52**
5.100.9–11: **53**
9.33.11–12: **2**
11.4–6: **57**
16.27.1–3: **59**
16.27.5: **61**
16.34.3–4: **59**
16.35.1–2: **61**
18.42.5–7: **76**
18.47.5–13: **76**
18.49.2–50.5: **77**
18.51.10–52.3: **77**
21.4.1–2 and 6–8: **94**
21.24.4–6: **98**
21.25.9–11: **94**
21.29.1–2 and 9: **94**
21.30.6–7: **94**
21.30.15–21.31.5: **94**
21.31.16: **94**
21.43.24–27: **97**
21.46.1: **98**
21.46.11: **104**
22.4.9–17: **105**
22.5: **102**
22.6: **106**
22.11.1–4: **106**
22.15: **110**
23.1.1–5: **106**
23.1.10–13: **106**
23.4: **111**
23.5.1: **112**
23.9.1 and 3: **114**
23.16.4–5: **115**
24.1.1–3: **114**
24.5.3 and 7: **114**
24.9.12–13: **113**
24.14.1–3 and 10: **114**
24.15.1–12: **114**
25.4: **102**
25.5–6.1: **102**
27.4.4–6: **121**
27.19.1–2: **122**
28.1.1 and 6–9: **122**
28.1.7–8: **121**
28.7.8–15: **119**
28.17.4–9: **121**, **122**
28.17.13–15: **122**
28.19.1–7: **122**
28.20.1: **122**
28.23.1: **122**
29.2.1–3: **122**
29.7.6–8: **121**
29.10.1–4: **121**
29.11.1–5: **121**
29.19.1–9: **121**
29.24.10: **122**
29.25.1–4 and 6: **122**
29.27.1–7: **122**
30.3.1–2 and 7–9: **123**
31.1.2–8: **134**
31.1.6–7: **135**
31.32.1–2: **134**
32.1.5–7: **134**
32.7.1–5: **140**
32.16.5: **142**
33.1.1–2: **142**
33.6.1–2 and 6–9: **143**
33.7.1–4: **142**
33.12.2–5: **142**
33.13.4–5: **142**
33.15.3–4: **144**
35.4.10–11: **38** Appendix
38.11.2: **147**

Tacitus *Annales*
4.43.1–3: **50**, **150**, **159**

Zonaras
8.3.4: **27**
9.31: **147**

INDEX II

EPIGRAPHIC SOURCES

American Journal of Archaeology (AJA)
11 (1896) pp. 582–86, no. 67: **47**
Ancient World
12 (1985) pp. 3–14: **5**
Annuario della Scuola archeologica di Atene
22–23 (1944–45): "Tituli Calymnii," no. 79: **21**
Archäologisch-epigraphische Mitteilungen aus Österreich-Ungarn (AEM)
10 (1887) p. 190: **21** Appendix
10 (1887) pp. 197f.: **66**
Arkhaiologike ephemeris (AE)
1859, pp. 1823–24, no. 3493: **40**
1887, pp. 9–24: **38**
1901, pp. 124–28, no. 1: **70**
1905, pp. 55f.: **33**
1905, pp. 57f.: **41**
1908, pp. 212f., no. 3: **164**
1911, p. 34, no. 23: **19**
1913, pp. 25f., nos. 165a-165b: **54**
1913, pp. 43f., no. 173: **54**
1913, pp. 51–52, no. 181: **23** Appendix
1917, pp. 15–18, no. 308: **62**
1918, pp. 151–54, nos. 5–5a: **46**
1920, pp. 82–86: **158**
1925–26, pp. 71–75, no. 7: **138**
1927–28, pp. 119–27: **154**
1932, pp. 19–21, no. 5: **26** Appendix
1937, pp. 708–14: **38**
1945–47, p. 108, no. 46: **22** Appendix
Bulletin de correspondance hellénique (BCH)
3 (1879) pp. 290–315: **164**
4 (1880) pp. 47–59: **169**
4 (1880) pp. 264–66, no. 2: **64**
5 (1881) pp. 101–5, no. 6: **101**
5 (1881) p. 150, no. 1: **40**
5 (1881) p. 387: **126**
6 (1882) pp. 356–87: **32**, **79**, **154**, **156**
9 (1885) pp. 244–46, nos. 2–3: **80**
10 (1886) pp. 235–44: **21**
13 (1889) pp. 47–51, no. 1: **47**
13 (1889) pp. 51–54, no. 2: **48**
13 (1889) p. 379, no. 2: **78**
13 (1889) pp. 407–8: **17**
24 (1900) pp. 74–79: **13** Appendix

BCH (continued)
24 (1900) pp. 190f., no. 5: **138**
24 (1900) p. 200, no. 6: **151**
25 (1901) pp. 337–44, no. 1: **30**, **31**
25 (1901) pp. 344f., no. 2: **55**, **56**
25 (1901) pp. 347–54, no. 3: **153**
26 (1902) p. 570: **16**
27 (1903) pp. 104f.: **1**, **22**, **88**, **163**
29 (1905) pp. 204–9, no. 67: **164**
29 (1905) pp. 209f., no. 68: **92**
30 (1906) p. 326: **117**
35 (1911) pp. 460f.: **117**
48 (1924) pp. 381–98: **131**
49 (1925) pp. 100–101: **55**
56 (1932) pp. 3–5: **88**
60 (1936) pp. 15f.: **13** Appendix
64–65 (1940–41) pp. 113–20: **166**
66–67 (1942–43) pp. 124–25, A: **126**
66–67 (1942–43) pp. 143–46: **23**
77 (1953) pp. 616–28, no. 1: **36**
82 (1958) pp. 67–69: **30**, **31**
89 (1965) pp. 665–81: **89**
90 (1966) pp. 256–62, no. 5: **16** Appendix
105 (1981) pp. 576–80: **157**
108 (1984) pp. 703–7: **157**
109 (1985) pp. 499–44: **18** Appendix
116 (1992) pp. 197–215: **20**
Collection of Ancient Greek Inscriptions in the British Museum (BMus)
299: **21**
403: **74**
404–405: **99**, **160**
406–408: **160**
410: **25**
412: **100**
424: **143**
485: **30** Appendix
526: **24** Appendix
Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum (CIG)
1711: **88**
2152b: **15** Appendix
2254: **26**
2265: **83**
2265b: **92**
2556: **67**
2561b *add.*: **158**
2905: **74**, **99**, **160**
2909: **4**
3047: **58**
3598: **8** Appendix
Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum (CIL)
III.1.567: **88**, **163**
Crampa, *Labraunda* III.1
1, 5–7: **27** Appendix
Ἑλληνικά
11 (1939) pp. 263–71: **107**
Fouilles de Delphes III *(FDelphes* III)
1.260: **14** Appendix
1.362: **129**
1.578: **166**
2.89: **117**
2.136: **126**
2.142: **126**
3.243: **126**
3.383: **117**
4.38: **133**
4.38–42: **167**
4.276: **163**
4.278: **163**
4.280: **1**, **22**, **88**, **163**
4.292–295: **88**
4.351: **30**, **31**
4.352: **89**
4.354: **129**
4.355: **153**
4.368: **157**
Helly, *Gonnoi*, vol. 2
93: **54**

98: **54**
106–107: **11** Appendix
Hesperia
30 (1961) pp. 222–23, no. 19: **164**
35 (1966) pp. 323–26, no. 6: **44**
35 (1966) pp. 326–29, no. 7: **152**
37 (1968) p. 220: **24**
45 (1976) pp. 253–66: **87**
55 (1986) pp. 88–102: **39** Appendix
Inschriften von Assos
9: **10** Appendix
Inschriften von Ephesos
7: **170**
1485: **30** Appendix
1526: **24** Appendix
Inschriften von Iasos II
612: **161**
Inschriften von Ilion
52: **8** Appendix
Inschriften von Lampsakos
T 105: **90**
Inschriften von Magnesia am Maeander (IMagM)
p. xiii, no. 50: **25**
46: **58**
65: **127**
75–76: **127**
93: **120**
105: **158**
Inschriften von Mylasa
134: **101**
251–260: **19** Appendix
Inschriften von Olympia (IOlympia)
46: **116**
47: **137**
48: **4** Appendix
49: **36** Appendix
50: **69**
51: **31** Appendix
52: **150**, **159**
Inschriften von Parion
T 59: **90**
Inschriften von Pergamon (IPergamon)
225: **142**
245: **146**
268: **170**
Inschriften von Priene *(IPriene)*
16: **25**
27: **100**
37–38: **74**
39: **143**
40–41: **74**, **99**, **160**
42: **160**
65: **91**
111: **171**
120–121: **171**
139: **4**
T 500: **26**
T 531: **120**
T 534: **25**
Inscriptiones Creticae (IC)
I.viii, pp. 63–65, no. 9: **127**
I.xvi, pp. 112–24, nos. 3–4: **164**
I.xvi, pp. 134–36, no. 18: **164**
I.xviii, pp. 187–89, no. 9: **165**
II.xi, pp. 131–33, no. 1: **29**
II.xii, pp. 158–61, no. 20: **47**
II.xii, pp. 161–62, no. 21: **58**
II.xxx, pp. 310–12, no. 1: **1** Appendix
III.iii, pp. 24–28, no. 1A: **48**
III.iii, pp. 43–49, no. 4: **67**
III.iv, pp. 91–111, nos. 9–10: **158**
IV.174: **6** Appendix
IV.176: **127**
IV.181–182: **128**
IV.184: **5** Appendix
Inscriptiones Graecae (IG)
II^2 236: **2**
II^2 778–779: **3** Appendix
II^2 861: **3** Appendix

IG (continued)
II^2 951: **132**
II^2 1135 and *add.*: **165**
II^2 *add.* p. 669: **132**
IV.752: **138**
IV.791: **151**
IV.924: **14**
IV.926: **38**
IV.927: **63**
IV.929: **20** Appendix
IV.941: **138**
IV^2 1, p. xxvii: **151**
IV^2 1.68: **14**
IV^2 1.70: **38**
IV^2 1.71: **38**
IV^2 1.72: **46**
IV^2 1.75: **63**
IV^2 1.76: **138**
IV^2 1.77: **138**
IV^2 1.78: **20** Appendix
V.1, p. xv: **159**
V.1.931: **80**
V.1.1111: **81**
V.1.1429–1430: **40**
V.2.344: **43**
V.2.415: **33** Appendix
V.2.419: **40**
V.2.443–445: **168**
V.2.496: **40** Appendix
VII.188–189: **85**
VII.2792: **17**
VII.4130–4131: **12** Appendix
IX.1.689: **118**
IX.1.690: **131**
IX.2.7: **125**
IX.2.89: **32**, **79**, **154**, **156**
IX.2.205: **56**
IX.2.214: **37** Appendix
IX.2.261: **25** Appendix
IX.2.487: **34** Appendix
IX.2.488: **35** Appendix
IX.2.520: **78**
IX.2.521: **70**
IX.2.1106: **7** Appendix
IX.2 *add.* no. 205 I: **153**
IX.2 *add.* no.205 II: **30**, **31**
IX.2 *add.* no. 205 IIIA: **55**
IX.2 *add.* no. 205 IIIB: **56**
IX^2 1.3A: **33**
IX^2 1.3B: **41**
IX^2 1.177: **55**
IX^2 1.188: **56**
IX^2 1.748: **89**
XI.1063: **68**
XI.1064: **92**
XI.1065: **83**
XI.1066: **57**
XII.1.1031: **64**
XII.3.1259: **3**
XII.5.128 (and *add.*): **83**
XII.7.67B: **2** Appendix
XII.9.4: **15** Appendix
XII.9.223: **19**
XII *supp.* no. 136: **92**
XII *supp.* no. 139: **9** Appendix
XII *supp.* no. 142: **146**
Inscriptiones Graecae ad res Romanas pertinentes (IGRR)
287: **142**
1021: **158**
IV.297: **170**
IV.1558: **169**
Inscriptions de Délos
1513–1514: **164**
Iscrizioni storiche ellenistiche (ISE)
43: **63**
44: **14**
51: **145**
91: **131**
Jahresheft des Österreichischen Archäologischen Instituts (JÖAI)
8 (1905) pp. 285f.: **125**

Klio
10 (1910) pp. 397–98: **33**
15 (1918) pp. 9–14, no. 37: **55**, **56**
15 (1918) pp. 15–20, nos. 39–40: **166**
16 (1919) pp. 123f., nos. 117–118: **88**
16 (1919) pp. 160f., nos. 130–131: **167**
18 (1923) p. 261, no. 201: **23**
18 (1923) p. 264, no. 202: **28**
18 (1923) p. 267, no. 14: **166**
18 (1923) pp. 272f., nos. 21–26: **126**
18 (1923) p. 285, nos. 211–212: **157**
Kontorini, *Rhodiaka* I
pp. 29–42, no. 2: **165**
Κρητικὰ Χρονικά
21 (1969) pp. 9–53: **164**, **32** Appendix
LeBas/Foucart
228: **81**
317a: **40**
328a: **40**
353: **43**
853: **88**
1179: **56**
LeBas/Waddington
1: **3**
71: **58**
86: **13**
189–194: **74**
195–198: **99**, **160**
200–204: **160**
205: **74**
206–207: **160**
Michel
14: **3**
16: **67**
20: **38**
22: **56**
28: **164**
31: **159**
34: **13**
36: **26**
57: **58**
187: **40**
199: **43**
235: **12** Appendix
325: **169**
459: **28** Appendix
484: **4**
1340: **21**
1485–1486: **3** Appendix
Milet
148: **109**
149: **103**
150: **108**
152: **9** Appendix
Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abt. Athens (MDAI[A])
4 (1879) pp. 206–17, no. 1: **125**
59 (1934) pp. 47–52: **63**
Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abt. Istanbul (MDAI[I])
29 (1979) pp. 239–71: **71**
Orientis Graecae Inscriptiones Selectae (OGIS)
13: **26**
242: **30** Appendix
327: **142**
335: **146**
351: **143**
437: **170**
Orlandos, Ἡ Ἀρκαδικὴ Ἀλίφειρα (1967–68)
pp. 151–57, no. 2: **37**
pp. 158–67, nos. 3–4: **82**

Parola del passato (PP)
33 (1978) pp. 153–56: **15**
Peek, *ASAW* 60.2 (1969)
pp. 23–25, no. 25: **38**
pp. 26–27, no. 30: **63**
pp. 27–28, no. 31: **138**
p. 28: **20** Appendix
Phoenix
43 (1989) pp. 317–46: **42**
Pouilloux, *Choix d' inscriptions grecques*
4: **130**
Proceedings of the 8th Epigraphic Conference (1984)
pp. 259–70: **5**
Recueil des inscriptions juridiques grecques (RIJG)
10: **21**
16: **38**
Revue de philologie (RPh)
35 (1911) pp. 289–93, nos. 41–41a: **65**
63 (1937) pp. 337–44: **90**
3.13 (1939) pp. 97–122, no. 1: **85**
Revue des études anciennes (REA)
44 (1942) pp. 31–51: **164**
Robert, *Claros* I, pp. 63–104: **162**
Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften (SGDI)
319: **92**
1415: **56**
1432: **125**
1634: **43**
3025: **38**
3089: **66**
3204: **131**
3205: **118**
3277: **3**
3591–3592: **21**
3758: **74**
4319: **64**
4530: **81**
4546–4547: **80**
4645–4647: **40**
5015–5016: **128**
5022: **5** Appendix
5024: **6** Appendix
5040: **67**
5043: **48**
5060: **158**
5147: **165**
5149: **164**
5153–5154: **127**
5177: **58**
5588: **4**
IV, pp. 1034–35, no. 5: **164**
Schmitt
403: **2**
446: **14**
454: **1** Appendix
471: **29**
480: **33**
489: **38**
495: **40**
499: **43**
501: **47**
502: **48**
550: **57**
574: **19**
Schwyzer
48: **81**
71: **40**
85: **3**
104: **138**
157: **38**
195: **164**
263: **21**
289: **74**
381: **33**
388: **56**
396: **41**
428: **43**
555: **30**, **31**

631: **9** Appendix
Sherk, *Roman Documents from the Greek East*
4: **131**
6: **143**
7: **120**
9: **32**, **79**, **154**, **156**
10: **99**, **160**
14: **158**
37: **88**
39: **88**
42: **163**
47: **170**
Sitzungsberichte der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien (SAWW)
132.2 (1895) p. 9, no. 1: **124**
Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum (SEG)
I.75: **14**
I.410: **1** Appendix
II.259: **28**
II.264: **23**
II.265–268: **126**
II.275: **14** Appendix
II.276: **166**
II.279: **157**
II.511: **158**
III.451: **131**
IV.662: **8** Appendix
XI.377: **63**
XI.405: **63**
XI.972: **145**
XI.1122: **18**
XIII.259: **80**
XIII.278: **36**
XIII.327: **85**
XVII.195: **17** Appendix
XVIII.238: **30**, **31**
XVIII.570: **130**
XIX.720: **29** Appendix
XXI.484: **164**
XXIII.178: **44**
XXIII.180: **152**
XXIII.236: **16** Appendix
XXIII.297: **16**
XXIII.305: **89**
XXV.448: **37**
XXV.449: **82**
XXVI.392: **87**
XXVI.1049: **32** Appendix
XXVII.123: **88**
XXVIII.697: **15**
XXIX.1130 *bis*: **71**
Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum^{3} *(SIG*^{3}*)*
261: **3**
344: **13**
421A: **33**
421B: **41**
464–465: **3** Appendix
471: **38**
472: **40**
490: **43**
546A: **55**
546B: **56**
560: **58**
588: **109**
599: **74**
609–610: **88**
614–615: **117**
633: **108**
638: **118**
656: **169**
665: **137**
668: **139**
674: **32**, **79**, **154**, **156**
679: **120**
683: **159**
685: **158**
688: **99**, **160**
712: **164**

SIG^3 *(continued)*
826: **1**, **22**, **88**, **163**
827: **88**
933: **17**
953: **21**
955: **2** Appendix
Tod, *Greek Historical Inscriptions (GHI)*
177: **2**
179: **3**
Welles, *Royal Correspondence (RC)*
3–4: **13**
7: **26**
8: **25**
17: **30** Appendix
46: **100**
Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik (ZPE)
77 (1989) pp. 55–66: **42**

INDEX III

NAMES OF PERSONS AND PLACES

Abdera: **169**
Achaia: **33**, **36**, **38**, **39**, **43**, **44**, **46**, **61**, **63**, **75**, **76**, **80**, **81**, **85**, **86**, **87**, **96**, **105**, **109**, **111**, **113**, **115**, **116**, **119**, **122**, **135**, **136**, **137**, **140**, **145**, **147**, **149**, **31** Appendix
Achaia Phthiotis: **30**, **31**, **32**, **55**, **56**, **76**, **79**, **154**, **156**
Achaios the Seleukid: **49**, **51**
C. Acilius: **27**
Manius Acilius Glabrio (*RE* 35): **1**, **22**, **88**, **163**
M. Aemilius Lepidus (*RE* 68): **59**, **60**, **121**
M. Aemilius M. f.: **120**
L. Aemilius Paullus (*RE* 114): **121**, **126**
Aetos of Aspendos: **42**
Agathokles of Egypt: **52**
Agathokles of Syracuse: **10**
Agrai: **33**
Aigai: **92**, **9** Appendix, **24** Appendix, **29** Appendix
Aigialeus the Achaian: **38**
Aigion: **46**
Aigosthena: **33**, **85**
Ainos: **106**
Aischines of Athens: **1**
Aitolia: **12**, **33**, **40**, **41**, **53**, **55**, **56**, **57**, **76**, **82**, **94**
Akarnania: **33**, **41**, **85**, **132**
Akragas: **9**, **10**
Akraipheia: **17**, **12** Appendix, **13** Appendix
Akrotatos of Sparta: **9**, **10**
Alabanda: **10** Appendix, **15** Appendix
Alexander III: **2**, **5**, **6**, **7**, **24**, **26**, **74**
Alexander IV: **24**
Alipheira: **37**, **82**, **4** Appendix
Alkibiades of Sparta: **111**
Ambrakia: **131**, **132**, **18** Appendix
Ambryssos: **1**, **22**, **126**, **163**
Amphissa: **1**, **22**, **88**, **117**, **133**, **149**, **163**
Amynandros of Athamania: **57**
Angeiai: **65**
Antaios of Mopseion: **70**
Antigonos I: **11**, **12**, **13**, **14**, **15**
Antigonos III: **45**, **47**, **48**, **50**, **74**
Antikyra: **1**, **22**, **88**, **163**
Antiochos I: **146**
Antiochos II: **74**, **29** Appendix

Antiochos III: 52, 58, 60, 73, 76, 77, 84, 90, 93, 94, 97, 98, 104, 30 Appendix
Antiochos IV: 121, 122
Antiphates of Crete: 144
Antissa: 92
M. Antonius M. f. (*RE* 30): 50, 159
Apollodoros of Athens: 117
Apollodoros the Boiotian: 115
Apollodoros of Priene: 74, 91
Apollonia (Crete): 128
Apollonia (Illyria): 9, 118
Apollonia (Thrace): 66
Aratos of Sikyon: 39
Araxa (Lycia): 130
Areus of Sparta: 111
Argos: 3, 39, 44, 135, 136, 152
Ariarathes V: 143
Aristippos II of Argos: 39
Aristokleas of Amphissa: 163
Aristokrates of Rhodes: 144
Aristomenes the Achaian: 116
Arkesine: 21, 2 Appendix
Arsinoë (in Cilicia): 42
Arsinoë (Methana): 46, 138
Asine: 76
Aspendos: 6
Assos: 10 Appendix
Astymedes of Rhodes: 144
Athamania: 106, 131
Athens: 12, 57, 59, 75, 84, 94, 109, 126, 132, 133, 140, 141, 164, 167, 3 Appendix, 39 Appendix
Attalos I: 49, 59, 73
Attalos II: 114, 119, 123, 134, 142, 143, 148
Augustus: 81
L. Aurelius Orestes (*RE* 179): 147
Aution of Lato: 164, 32 Appendix
C. Avidius Nigrinus: 88, 163, 25 Appendix
Azoros: 70, 118

Bargylia: 161
Biannos: 1 Appendix
Bithynia: 49, 51, 112, 114, 134, 142, 148
Boiotia: 16, 17, 33, 75, 85, 105, 115, 3 Appendix
Boumelita: 129
Boura: 18
Brykos: 64
Byzantion: 34, 49, 51, 52, 53

Q. Caecilius Metellus (*RE* 81): 106, 111
Q. Caecilius Metellus Macedonicus (*RE* 94): 147, 149
Q. Calpurnius Piso (*RE* 86): 159
L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus (*RE* 88): 158
Cappadocia: 114, 143
Carthage: 7, 10, 35
Chalai: 30
Chaleion: 89
Chalkis: 125, 166, 167
Charadros: 131, 132, 18 Appendix
Charisios of Magnesia: 127
Charixenos the Aitolian: 41
Chios: 53, 57, 90, 98
Chyretiai: 62
App. Claudius Pulcher (*RE* 294): 106, 110, 111
Corinth: 38, 87, 147
P. Cornelius Blasio (*RE* 76): 131
P. Cornelius Lentulus (*RE* 202): 142
L. Cornelius Scipio (*RE* 337): 93, 94, 104
P. Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus (*RE* 335): 155, 38 Appendix

P. Cornelius Scipio Africanus (*RE* 336): **93**, **94**
Crete: **29**, **47**, **49**, **58**, **67**, **95**, **110**, **127**, **128**, **144**, 1 Appendix

Damon of Amphissa: **163**
Damothoinos of Pherai: **107**
Deinokrates of Messene: **113**, **115**
Delos: **68**, **140**, 8 Appendix
Delphi: **1**, **22**, **88**, **89**, **117**, **126**, **163**, 14 Appendix
Demetrias: **30**, **31**
Demetrios I (Poliorketes): **12**, **14**, **25**
Demosthenes of Athens: **1**, **2**
Diagoras of Kos: **21**
Diaios the Achaian: **147**
Diopeithes of Rhodes: **119**
Diophanes the Achaian: **96**, **111**, **116**
Dyme: **36**, **31** Appendix
Dyrrhachion: **118**

Echedemos of Athens: **94**
Eleutherna: **47**, **58**
Elis: **20**, **37**, **76**, **82**, **87**, **159**
Epainetos the Boiotian: **115**
Ephesos: **170**, 24 Appendix, 30 Appendix
Epidamnos: **58**
Epidauros: **38**, **46**, **63**, **20** Appendix
Epidauros Limera: **80**
Epiros: **57**, **72**, **85**, **106**
Eresos: **92**, 9 Appendix
Eretria: **19**, **81**, **83**, **129**, **166**
Erikinion: **62**, 34 Appendix
Erythrai (Asia): **98**, **171**
Erythrai (Greece): **125**
Euboia: **149**, **166**
Eukleidas of Delphi: **163**
Eukles of Rhodes: **77**
Eumenes I: **146**
Eumenes II: **98**, **104**, **106**, **112**, **114**, **119**, **121**, **123**, **134**
Euphaniskos of Rhodes: **74**, **117**
Euromos: **124**

Q. Fabius Labeo (*RE* 91): **95**
Q. Fabius Maximus (*RE* 110 or 111): **158**, **164**, **165**, 32 Appendix
Ser. Fulvius Flaccus (*RE* 64): **160**
M. Fulvius Nobilior (*RE* 91): **94**, **96**

Galatia: **112**, **114**, **123**, **134**
Gela: **10**
Geronthrai: **81**
Glaukias of Illyria: **9**
Gonnoi: **54**, **70**, 11 Appendix, 23 Appendix
Gorgippos of Troizen: **151**
Gortyn: **67**, **95**, **110**, **127**, **128**, **158**, **164**, **165**, 5 Appendix, 6 Appendix, 32 Appendix

Hagepolis of Rhodes: **121**
Hagesandros of Rhodes: **58**
Hagesilochos of Rhodes: **121**
Halikarnassos: **109**, 28 Appendix
Halai: **129**
Halos: **153**, 26 Appendix
Hamilcar: **10**
Hannibal: **95**, **112**
Heraia: **76**, 4 Appendix, 33 Appendix
Herakleia on Latmos: **103**, **108**, **109**
Herakleia Pontica: **34**, **93**
Herakleion: **54**
Hermione: **63**, **151**
Hierapytna: **48**, **67**, **158**, **164**, **165**, 6 Appendix, 32 Appendix
Hippokrates of Kos: **21**

Hippokrates of Olosson: 54
Hypata: 125, 166, 14 Appendix, 25 Appendix
Hypnia: 89

Ilion: 11, 102, 8 Appendix
Istros: 34
Itanos: 158, 163, 164, 32 Appendix

C. Julius Caesar (*RE* 130): 171
C. Julius Caesar (*RE* 131): 50, 159
Sex. Julius Caesar (*RE* 148, 149): 147

Kallatis: 34, 66, 21 Appendix
Kallikrates the Achaian: 135, 136, 137, 147
Kalydon: 56
Kalymna: 21
Kaphyai: 69
Karpathos: 64
Karystos: 81, 166, 15 Appendix
Kassander: 62
Kassandreia: 30, 31
Kassopa: 85
Kaudos: 5 Appendix
Kaunos: 109
Kavaros the Gaul: 51
Kierion: 11 Appendix, 25 Appendix
Kimolos: 2, 3
Klazomenai: 15, 71
Kleomedes of Kos: 21
Kleomenes III of Sparta: 45, 47, 50
Kleonai: 44, 152
Kleonymos of Sparta: 29
Kleopatra II: 122
Kleophantos of Kos: 21
Knidos: 12, 21, 71, 109
Knossos: 95, 110, 127, 128, 158, 164, 165, 32 Appendix
Kolophon: 15, 154, 162, 171
Kondaia: 70, 23 Appendix
Kopai: 17
Korkyra: 118, 131
Koroneia: 16
Kos: 13, 15, 21, 8 Appendix
Kotys of Thrace: 169
Krates of Priene: 171
Kratinos of Tritea: 89
Kritolaos the Achaian: 147, 149
Ktimenai: 65
Kydonia: 95, 110, 128
Kyme: 30 Appendix
Kytinion (Doris): 139
Kyzikos: 52, 109

Labraunda: 27 Appendix
Ladikos of Askyris: 70
Lamia: 139, 3 Appendix, 25 Appendix, 35 Appendix
Lampsakos: 77, 90
Lanthes of Assos: 10 Appendix
Larisa: 23, 32, 70, 78, 107, 153, 12 Appendix
Larisa Kremaste: 78
Lato: 158, 164, 165, 32 Appendix
Lebadeia: 16
Lebedos: 4, 13, 15
Leon of Athens: 94
Leonnatos: 5
Leontomenes of Pherai: 107
Lepreion: 82
Lesbos: 92
Leukas: 76
P. Licinius Crassus (*RE* 60): 123
Lokris: 1, 11, 23, 89, 133, 167
Lousoi: 18
Lycia: 102, 130
Lykortas of Megalopolis: 96, 111, 115, 116

Lysanor of Apollonia: 118
Lysimacheia: 77
Lysimachos: 24, 25, 26, 74
Lyttos: 58, 127, 158, 164, 165, 32 Appendix

Magnesia on the Maiander: 25, 58, 103, 108, 109, 120, 127, 128, 154, 158, 171
Magnesia (Thessaly): 7 Appendix
Maiandrios of Miletos: 74
Makon of Larisa: 153
Gn. Manlius Vulso (*RE* 91): 74, 95, 98, 99, 100, 104, 160
Mantineia (Antigoneia): 39, 109
Q. Marcius Philippus (*RE* 79): 113, 121, 122
Maroneia: 106
Matropolis (Akarnania): 41
Medeios of Larisa: 32
Megalopolis: 40, 43, 45, 76, 82, 109, 116, 135, 136, 137, 145, 168, 17 Appendix
Megara: 38, 85, 105, 13 Appendix
Melitaia: 30, 31, 32, 55, 56, 76, 79, 153, 154, 156, 157
Melos: 2, 3
Menalkidas of Sparta: 147
Menippos: 54
Menippos of Kolophon: 162
Messana: 10
Messene: 40, 50, 76, 86, 113, 115, 116, 145, 150, 159, 16 Appendix
Methydrion: 43
Methymna: 92, 9 Appendix
Metropolis (Ionia): 162
Metropolis (Thessaly): 25 Appendix
Miletos: 50, 63, 91, 92, 98, 100, 103, 108, 109, 120, 127, 150, 159, 164, 171, 9 Appendix
Mondaia: 70, 118
Q. Mucius Scaevola (*RE* 22): 170
L. Mummius L. f.: 150, 152, 159
Myania: 1, 88, 89
Mylasa: 101, 109, 120, 124, 160, 10 Appendix, 19 Appendix, 27 Appendix
Myndos: 109
Myos: 98, 108, 109, 120, 127
Mytilene: 13, 57, 92, 146

Nabis: 96
Nagidos: 42
Narthakion: 32, 76, 79, 154, 156
Naryka: 11
Naxos: 19, 83, 2 Appendix
Nikanor of Macedon: 59
Nikatas of Delphi: 163
Nikomedes of Bithynia: 142, 148
Nikostratos of Rhodes: 74
T. Numisius Tarquiniensis (*RE* 10): 122
Nysandros of Larisa: 78

Oiniadai: 41
Olos: 158, 164, 165, 32 Appendix
Opous: 23
Orchomenos: 43
Ornichidas of Delphi: 1, 163
Orophernes of Kappadokia: 143
Oropos: 141
Orthagoras of Araxa: 130
Othorne: 107

Pagai: 33, 85
Pamphylia: 104
Pantaleon the Aitolian: 55
L. Papirius Cursor (*RE* 52): 8
Parion: 90
Paros: 19, 83, 8 Appendix
Patrai: 109, 145

Pausanias of Thessaly: 1, 22, 163
Pausimachos of Kos: 21
Peisistratos of Boiotia: 75
Pellana: 46
Perdikkas of Macedon: 58
Pereia: 31, 56
Pergamon: 49, 73, 112, 114, 123, 134, 142, 146
Perrhaibia: 106, 118, 7 Appendix
Perseus: 102, 121
Petraios: 54
Peuma: 30, 31, 56
Phaeneas of Aitolia: 84
Phalanna: 62
Phalasarna: 29, 110
Phanoteus: 20, 157
Pharnakes: 114
Pharsalos: 76
Phayttos: 34 Appendix, 35 Appendix
Phigaleia: 40, 16 Appendix
Philinos of Kos: 21
Philip II: 1, 2, 24, 45, 50, 159
Philip III Arrhidaios: 24
Philip V: 53, 54, 57, 58, 59, 61, 62, 72, 106, 27 Appendix
Philippi: 5
Philopoimen: 82, 96, 105, 111, 113, 115
Philotas: 5
Phlygonion: 126
Phokaia: 91, 98
Phokis: 149, 157
Phylladon/Phyliadon: 31, 56
Physkos: 89
Pidasa: 103
Pitane: 146
Polichne: 107
Polybios: 116, 119
Polyrhenia: 29
Pontos: 114
C. Popilius Laenas (*RE* 7): 122
C. Poppaeus Sabinus: 25 Appendix
Poseidonios of Bargylia: 161
Praxikles of Naxos: 21, 2 Appendix
Priansos: 67, 6 Appendix
Priene: 4, 25, 26, 74, 91, 98, 99, 100, 109, 120, 143, 160, 171
Prousias I: 49, 51, 106, 112
Prousias II: 114, 121, 134, 142, 148
Pteleion: 78
Ptolemy I: 12
Ptolemy II: 35
Ptolemy III: 42
Ptolemy IV: 52, 53, 57
Ptolemy V: 60, 77
Ptolemy VI: 121, 122, 128, 138, 158
Ptolemy VIII: 122
Pyllos of Macedon: 32
Pylos: 76
Pyrrhos: 27, 29
Pytheas of Thebes: 149

T. Quinctius Flamininus (*RE* 3): 62, 72, 75, 76, 79, 84, 86, 105, 111, 112, 113, 156

Rhaukos: 128
Rhodes: 12, 25, 26, 51, 52, 53, 57, 58, 59, 61, 63, 68, 74, 77, 94, 98, 99, 101, 102, 108, 109, 114, 117, 119, 121, 122, 124, 143, 144, 160, 161, 165, 8 Appendix
Rome: 8, 27, 32, 35, 57, 59, 60, 61, 72, 73, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 84, 88, 93, 94, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 104, 106, 112, 113, 114, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 126, 131, 133, 134, 135, 136, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144,

147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 155, 156, 158, 159, 160, 162, 163, 164, 165, 167, 169, 170, 25 Appendix, 32 Appendix, 38 Appendix

Samnium: 8, 27
Samos: 26, 74, 92, 98, 99, 110, 154, 160, 171, 9 Appendix
Samothrace: 24
Sarapion of Athens: 164
Sardis: 170, 171
Seleukos I: 146
Seleukos II: 27 Appendix
Manius Sergius (*RE* 16): 134, 135, 136
Side: 6
Sikinos: 68
Sikyon: 85, 141
Skarphai: 133, 167
Smyrna: 71, 77, 91, 98, 100
Solovettius the Galatian: 124
Sosibios of Egypt: 52
Sosigenes of Rhodes: 119
Sparta: 29, 45, 50, 80, 81, 96, 111, 135, 136, 137, 139, 147, 150, 159, 37 Appendix, 39 Appendix
Stiris: 20
Stratonikeia: 101, 161
Stratos: 33, 41
Ser. Sulpicius Galba (*RE* 58): 158
C. Sulpicius Gallus (*RE* 66): 134, 135, 136
Syracuse: 8, 10

Tarentum: 8, 10, 27
Tegea: 69
Telmissos: 28 Appendix
Temnos: 71
Tenos: 80
Teos: 13, 15, 58, 109, 169
Thaumakoi: 65, 37 Appendix
Thearidas of Megalopolis: 116, 147
Thebes (Achaia Phthiotis): 30, 31, 153, 26 Appendix
Thebes (Boiotia): 129, 149
Thelpoussa: 46
Theogenes of Miletos: 108, 109
Thessaly: 22, 23, 32, 79, 106, 118, 154, 156, 157, 22 Appendix, 23 Appendix, 25 Appendix, 35 Appendix
Thoas of Aitolia: 84
Thouria: 116, 145
Thrace: 5, 24, 169
Thraseas of Aspendos: 42
Thrasykrates of Rhodes: 57
Thronion: 133, 167
Thyrrheion: 41, 85
Tiberius: 50, 159
Timaios the Aitolian: 40
Timolaos of Sparta: 96
Trajan: 88, 25 Appendix
Tralles: 171
Trikka: 22 Appendix
Triphylia: 76
Tritea: 89
Troizen: 138, 151

Xyniai: 55

Zarax: 80
Zeuxippos of Boiotia: 75, 105

INDEX IV

SUBJECTS

advocates: 19, 21, 31, 74, 78, 80, 81, 85, 91, 103, 116, 117, 124, 125, 129, 130, 145, 146, 153, 159, 162, 163, 168, 169, 170
amnesty: 71, 90, 109
appeal: 38, 63, 67, 80, 100, 120, 129, 137, 156, 159, 160, 164, 166, 171

boundary examinations: 30, 31, 38, 45, 55, 63, 70, 74, 82, 88, 129, 146, 153, 160, 163, 164

common land (*koine chora*): 40, 56, 63, 89, 138
compensation/restitution for injury or damages: 59, 71, 72, 75, 109, 138, 142, 163, 164
compromissum: 129, 145, 146, 153, 164
conflict, resolution of: 8, 9, 10, 12, 25, 27, 34, 35, 49, 51, 52, 53, 57, 58, 60, 61, 66, 73, 86, 90, 93, 94, 95, 108, 109, 112, 114, 115, 121, 122, 123, 127, 134, 142, 143, 144, 148, 155, 158, 164
cults, festivals, and religious jurisdiction: 4, 11, 16, 44, 65, 152, 26 Appendix, 27 Appendix, 28 Appendix, 39 Appendix

deditio: 86, 96
default: 21, 39, 117, 170, 171
delegation of arbitral authority: 33, 38, 46, 54, 55, 57, 98, 100, 120, 126, 131, 135, 136, 141, 158, 159, 160, 163, 164, 166, 170, 171
diagramma: 5, 7, 15, 54, 67

ekkletos dike, *ekkletos polis*: 13, 19, 47, 48, 67, 71, 90, 170, 2 Appendix, 3 Appendix, 28 Appendix
escort of judges (*dikastagogoi*): 63, 92, 117, 129

federal *koina* (and other associations):
Achaia: 33, 36, 38, 39, 43, 44, 46, 61, 63, 75, 76, 80, 81, 85, 86, 87, 96, 105, 109, 111, 113, 115, 116, 119, 122, 135, 136, 137, 140,

federal *koina*: Achaia (*continued*) 141, 144, 145, 147, 168, 31 Appendix
Ainians: 125
Aitolia: 12, 33, 40, 41, 53, 55, 56, 57, 76, 84, 94, 117
Akarnania: 33, 41
Boiotia: 16, 17, 33, 85, 105, 115, 3 Appendix
Corinthian League: 2, 3, 14, 45
Crete: 67, 110, 158
Delphic Amphiktyony: 1, 88, 133, 139, 141, 166, 167
Euboia: 166
Hellenic League (Antigonid): 2, 14
Ilian League: 11
Ionian League: 4
Lakedaimonians: 81
Lesbos: 92, 9 Appendix
Lycia: 130
Perrhaibia: 118, 7 Appendix
Phokis: 157
Thessaly: 79, 106, 107, 118, 153, 154, 157, 25 Appendix
foreign judges: 81, 101, 105, 8 Appendix, 9 Appendix, 10 Appendix, 11 Appendix, 12 Appendix, 13 Appendix, 14 Appendix, 15 Appendix

guarantee clauses: 2, 14, 28, 33, 37, 67, 90, 92, 109, 129, 138, 146, 153, 164, 167, 1 Appendix

hieromnemonic vote: 23, 88, 133, 139, 166, 167
honorary decrees: 40, 66, 78, 80, 81, 85, 87, 101, 117, 124, 130, 161, 162, 169, 171

investigative commissions (Roman): 114, 134, 142, 155, 158, 164, 165, 32 Appendix
isopoliteia: 40, 42, 67, 108, 165, 170

koine eirene: 2, 14
koinodikion: 67, 110, 1 Appendix

loans and debts: 2, 14, 21, 128, 2 Appendix

monarchs: 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 13, 15, 21, 24, 25, 26, 27, 42, 45, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 72, 73, 74, 77, 84, 90, 93, 104, 106, 112, 114, 119, 121, 122, 123, 127, 128, 134, 138, 142, 143, 148, 155, 158, 169, 28 Appendix, 29 Appendix, 30 Appendix
multistate tribunals: 46, 52, 63, 92, 109, 118, 154

oaths: 21, 37, 71, 109, 129, 132, 158, 163, 165
obligatory arbitration/arbitration treaties: 2, 13, 14, 21, 33, 38, 43, 44, 47, 48, 67, 68, 71, 87, 89, 92, 97, 106, 108, 138, 164, 170, 1 Appendix, 9 Appendix

penalties, financial: 37, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47, 48, 54, 67, 71, 75, 83, 137, 138, 141, 153, 164, 167
postwar settlements: 71, 76, 90, 98, 108, 109, 116, 150, 152
prohibition of suits: 42, 63, 71, 83, 138, 167, 20 Appendix
publicani: 171
public land (*damosia chora*): 32, 42, 168

reprisal: 105, 138, 139, 168
resource use, disputes over: 17, 138, 171

sacred land/sanctuaries: 1, 16, 22, 24, 32, 45, 50, 62, 65, 74, 79, 88, 108, 109, 117, 120, 126, 153, 154, 156, 158, 159, 163, 164, 171, 26 Appendix, 27 Appendix
sealed evidence: 21, 28, 54, 71
senate: 76, 78, 79, 88, 96, 97, 99, 101, 102, 104, 106, 111, 114, 120, 121, 122, 123, 131, 133, 134, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 147, 148, 151, 155, 156, 158, 159, 160, 162, 163, 164, 167, 169, 171
senatus consulta: 1, 32, 79, 101, 120, 122, 131, 156, 158, 159, 160, 164
symbola: 40, 67, 90, 106, 132, 140, 2 Appendix, 3 Appendix, 4 Appendix, 5 Appendix, 6 Appendix, 7 Appendix
sympoliteia: 56, 89, 103, 124
synoikism: 13

territorial arbitration: 1, 3, 5, 6, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 38, 40, 41, 42, 44, 45, 46, 50, 54, 55, 56, 62, 63, 65, 70, 76, 79, 80, 82, 85, 88, 98, 99, 100, 101, 103, 104, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 116, 117, 118, 120, 125, 126, 128, 129, 130, 131, 135, 136, 137, 138, 146, 149, 150, 153, 154, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 162, 163, 164, 167, 168, 169, 171, 17 Appendix, 18 Appendix, 19 Appendix, 20 Appendix, 21 Appendix, 22 Appendix, 23 Appendix, 24 Appendix, 25 Appendix, 26 Appendix, 29 Appendix, 32 Appendix
testimony and evidence: 21, 26, 28, 71, 74, 129, 146, 158, 159, 163
time limits: 21, 67, 129, 145, 146, 153, 158, 164, 170
treaties, formulation of: 9, 10, 29, 51, 71, 109, 128, 138, 142, 165, 170, 32 Appendix
trespass: 71, 74
tribunals:
  chosen by lot: 83, 92, 159, 166, 170
  elected: 85, 158, 166
  selected: 146, 153

ultimatums: 59, 72, 122, 142
usufruct: 40, 138

witnesses (guarantors): 56, 153
witnesses (testimony): 30, 31, 54, 62, 70, 1 Appendix

INDEX V

GREEK AND LATIN TERMS

ἀγωνιστής, ὁ: 130
ἀδικέω: 2, 42, 52, 54, 67, 106, 111, 119, 158, 165, 170
ἀδίκημα, τό: 42, 59, 67, 83, 90, 97, 106, 111, 120, 125, 142, 158, 168
ἀδικία, ἡ: 71
ἄδικος, ον: 171
ἀδίκως: 78, 106, 113, 122, 133, 143, 156, 167
αἰτέω/αἰτέομαι: 71, 83, 105, 117, 129, 170
αἴτησις, ἡ: 120
αἰτία, ἡ: 80, 101, 102, 106, 119, 134, 158, 163, 164, 171
αἴτιος, α, ον: 147
ἄκριτος, ον: 137
ἄκυρος, ον: 40, 42, 109, 137, 156, 166
ἀμνηστία, ἡ: 71, 109
ἀμφιλέγω: 30, 46, 77, 80, 116, 117, 133, 137, 153, 161, 164, 166, 167
ἀμφιλογία, ἡ: 158
ἀμφίλογος, ον: 89, 117
ἀμφισβασίη, ἡ: 26, 74
ἀμφισβητέω: 2, 15, 21, 26, 42, 54, 74, 76, 77, 98, 101, 106, 107, 108, 113, 114, 126, 130, 135, 136, 146, 160
ἀμφισβήτημα, τό: 171
ἀμφισβητήσιμος, ον: 147
ἀμφισβήτησις, ἡ: 7, 80, 88, 155, 158, 167
ἀνακρίνω: 21
ἀνάκρισις, ἡ: 21, 162
ἀναμφισβήτητος, ον: 88, 146
ἀνθύπατος: 93, 126, 150, 152, 159, 170, 171
ἀντεγκαλέω: 158
ἀντίδικος, ον: 21, 71, 169
ἀντιλέγω: 2, 13, 20, 38, 40, 57, 85, 111, 129, 134, 135, 142, 1467, 166, 167, 168
ἀντιλογία, ἡ: 42, 106, 119, 147, 158
ἀντιποιέομαι: 33, 85, 88, 133, 137, 158, 167
ἀντιπρεσβεύομαι: 111, 162
ἀντίρρησις, ἡ: 76, 146
ἀπαλλάσσω: 142, 147, 158
ἀποδικάζω: 21
ἀπόδικος, ον: 125
ἀπόκριμα, τό: 146, 162, 164

ἀπολογέομαι: 106, 121, 122, 123, 134, 158
ἀπολογία, ἡ: 134
ἀπολύω: 125, 134, 161, 168
ἀποτίνω: 14, 27, 28, 37, 42, 47, 48, 67, 71, 83, 100, 107, 138, 142, 153, 165, 167, 1 Appendix
ἀποφαίνω: 71, 74, 108, 111, 114, 121, 154, 168
ἀπόφασις, ἡ: 74, 88, 94, 120, 122, 137, 146, 158
ἀποψηφίζομαι: 111
ἀσφράγιστος, ον: 21, 28
αὐτονομία, ἡ: 88, 102
αὐτοψία, ἡ: 88
ἀφορίζω: 42, 54, 71, 88
ἀφορισμός, ὁ: 88

βασιλεύς, ὁ: 5, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 21, 24, 26, 42, 47, 48, 51, 52, 53, 54, 57, 58, 59, 60, 65, 66, 74, 77, 84, 93, 94, 106, 114, 119, 121, 122, 127, 128, 134, 138, 142, 143, 146, 169, 171
βέβαιος, ον: 88, 137, 138, 162, 164
βλάβη, ἡ: 27, 72, 141, 142, 143, 170
βραβεύω: 158

γαῖκός, ή, όν: 41
γαοδίκαι, οἱ: 20, 41
γεωμέτρης, ὁ: 54
γῆ, ἡ: 5, 16, 74, 81, 135, 136, 142, 149

δημόσιος, α, ον: 42, 56, 71, 75, 83, 108, 109, 120, 137, 143, 156, 158, 159, 160, 163, 164, 168
διαβολή, ἡ: 134
διάγραμμα, τό: 5, 7, 13, 15, 54, 67
διαδικάζω: 15, 68, 127, 158, 168, 170
διαδικασία, ἡ: 170
διαίρεσις: 74
διαιρέω: 74
διαιτάω: 27
διαιτητής, ὁ: 153
διαιτός, ὁ: 153
διακρίνω: 6, 7, 11, 13, 74, 77, 98, 117, 121, 139
διάκρισις, ἡ: 65, 103
διαλλαγή, ἡ: 57
διαλλακτήρ/διαλλακτής, ὁ: 27, 147
διαλλακτήριος, ον: 34
διαλλάσσω: 12, 76, 93, 155
διάλυσις, ἡ: 12, 26, 34, 51, 52, 53, 57, 58, 60, 61, 77, 90, 94, 102, 114, 115, 121, 122, 127
διαλύω: 12, 13, 26, 40, 49, 51, 54, 58, 67, 71, 77, 81, 92, 93, 94, 110, 121, 122, 127, 137, 142, 148, 157, 8 Appendix
διαμαρτύρομαι: 122
διαμφισβητέω: 63, 65, 71, 111, 158
διαμφισβήτησις, ἡ: 158
διαπρεσβεύομαι: 34, 52, 93, 105
διάστασις, ἡ: 158
διατάσσω: 5, 7, 102, 160
διαφέρω: 57, 98, 101, 109, 114, 119, 127, 134, 135, 137, 158, 167
διαφορά, ἡ/διάφορον, τό: 7, 27, 71, 102, 105, 110, 111, 128, 135, 137, 143, 146, 147, 158, 164, 170, 171
διευκρινέω: 111, 134, 135
δικάζω: 3, 11, 21, 27, 43, 56, 67, 71, 83, 92, 137, 138, 146, 147, 149, 158, 163, 164, 167, 170, 1 Appendix, 15 Appendix
δικαιοδοσία, ἡ: 65, 105, 106, 140, 147

δικαιολογέομαι: 74, 80, 120, 171
δικαιολογία, ἡ: 52, 65, 129, 158
δικαιονομία, ἡ: 65
δίκαιος, α, ον: 21, 27, 42, 43, 66, 71, 74, 85, 106, 111, 114, 119, 120, 121, 122, 124, 129, 139, 140, 141, 146, 147, 155, 158, 164, 165, 168, 170, 171
δικαιοσύνη, ἡ: 120, 158
δικαίωμα, τό: 26
δικαίως: 85, 87, 129, 158, 163
δικασταγωγία, ἡ: 129
δικασταγωγός, ὁ: 92, 129
δικαστήριον, τό: 21, 28, 37, 38, 44, 67, 68, 69, 71, 83, 89, 101, 111, 120, 124, 126, 129, 135, 137, 154, 158, 168, 170, 1 Appendix
δικαστής, ὁ: 15, 18, 21, 23, 27, 28, 30, 31, 36, 38, 40, 46, 55, 63, 71, 80, 82, 83, 85, 87, 100, 106, 108, 111, 117, 119, 120, 125, 129, 135, 136, 137, 147, 154, 157, 158, 166, 171, 15 Appendix, 40 Appendix
δικαστοφυλακέω: 120
δίκη, ἡ: 4, 13, 21, 27, 38, 39, 42, 43, 44, 56, 59, 67, 71, 80, 81, 83, 90, 106, 114, 125, 131, 138, 142, 145, 149, 165, 168, 170, 8 Appendix
διορθόω: 119
διόρθωμα, τό: 89
διορίζω: 65, 74, 160
διώκων, ὁ: 39
δόγμα, τό: 1, 14, 42, 79, 88, 97, 101, 111, 119, 120, 122, 131, 156, 158, 159, 160, 162, 163, 164, 166, 171
δογματίζω: 158, 171
δόκημα, τό: 3
δυσδιάκριτος, ον: 155
δωσιδικία, ἡ: 146

ἔγγυος, ὁ: 67, 164
ἐγκαλέω: 26, 27, 42, 71, 74, 106, 134, 147, 155, 158, 170, 171
ἔγκλημα, τό: 12, 21, 37, 38, 39, 43, 63, 71, 83, 90, 106, 109, 111, 125, 139, 146, 147, 164, 167, 170
εἰρήνη, ἡ: 2, 10, 27, 33, 39, 40, 53, 57, 59, 68, 81, 87, 94, 106, 109, 114, 127, 128, 137, 151, 158
εἰσαγγέλλω: 14
εἰσάγω/εἰσηγέομαι: 14, 21, 25, 43, 71, 83, 146, 159
εἰσαγωγεύς, ὁ: 71, 92
ἐκδικάζω: 68, 125
ἐκδικέω: 103, 120, 125, 146
ἔκδικος, ὁ: 101, 120, 171
ἔκκλητος, ον: 13, 47, 48, 71, 90, 170, 2 Appendix, 3 Appendix, 28 Appendix
ἐκλύω: 148
ἐκμαρτυρέω: 21
ἐκμαρτυρία, ἡ: 21
ἐναντιόομαι: 171
ἔνοχος, ον: 57, 71
ἐξορκίζω/ἐξορκόω: 21
ἐπαμφίλλογος, ον: 159
ἐπήκοος, ὁ: 71, 83, 90
ἐπίδικος, ον: 45
ἐπικαλέω: 27
ἐπικληρόω: 159, 170
ἐπικρίνω: 13, 63, 89, 138, 145
ἐπίκρισις, ἡ: 65
ἐπικριτήριον, τό: 67
ἐπιλύω: 146
ἐπισκέπτομαι: 106, 114, 142, 147
ἐπίσκεψις, ἡ: 54
ἐπισκήπτω: 71, 78, 121
ἐπιτίμιον, τό/ἐπιτίμια, τά: 47, 54,

ἐπιτίμιον, τό/ἐπιτίμια, τά *(continued)* **63, 83, 127, 168, 20** Appendix
ἐπιτρέπω: **27, 71, 110, 127, 135, 136, 138, 156, 158, 161**
ἐπιτροπή, ἡ: **63, 98, 118, 122, 164**
ἐφηγέομαι: **129**
ἐφήγησις, ἡ: **129**
ἔχθρα, ἡ: **49, 71, 93, 105, 119, 158, 163, 170**
ἐχθρός, ά, όν: **35**

ζημία, ἡ: **80, 116, 137, 141, 149, 153**
ζημιόω: **14, 137**

ἡγεμονία, ἡ: **122**
ἡσσάομαι: **62, 68, 93, 112, 121, 155**
ἡσυχία, ἡ: **121**

ἱερομνημονέω: **51**
ἱερομνημοσύνη, ἡ: **133, 166, 167**
ἱερομνήμων, ὁ: **1, 22, 88, 133, 163, 166, 167**
ἱερόν, τό: **18, 24, 28, 30, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41, 42, 54, 55, 64, 66, 70, 74, 79, 80, 81, 82, 87, 88, 92, 93, 109, 116, 117, 120, 126, 129, 131, 138, 142, 145, 153, 156, 158, 164, 170, 26** Appendix
ἱερός, ά, όν: **1, 16, 22, 24, 42, 43, 62, 88, 108, 109, 120, 129, 153, 154, 156, 158, 163**
ἰσοπολιτεία, ἡ: **40, 165**
ἵστωρ/ϝίστωρ, ὁ: **1** Appendix

καρπίζω: **5, 40, 158, 171**
καταδικάζω: **21, 71, 163**
καταδίκη, ἡ: **71, 120**
κατάδικος, ον: **120**
καταιτιάομαι: **162**
κατακρίνω: **24, 74, 164, 170**
καταλλάκτης, ὁ: **147**
καταλύω: **10, 148**
καταφεύγω: **141, 143, 147**
κατηγορέω: **106, 114, 134, 148**
κατηγορία, ἡ: **106**
κατορθόω: **101**
κληρόω: **83, 89, 129, 170**
κοινοδίκιον: **67, 110**
κοινολογέομαι: **122, 142**
κοινολογία, ἡ: **114**
κρίμα, τό: **1, 22, 32, 41, 63, 74, 85, 106, 120, 125, 126, 129, 145, 153, 156, 160, 163, 164, 166, 171, 22** Appendix
κρίνω: **1, 3, 14, 20, 21, 22, 27, 30, 31, 32, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41, 46, 55, 56, 57, 62, 65, 68, 71, 72, 74, 79, 88, 89, 90, 92, 100, 101, 106, 107, 118, 120, 125, 126, 133, 135, 136, 137, 139, 145, 146, 147, 150, 153, 154, 157, 158, 159, 160, 162, 163, 164, 166, 167, 170, 8** Appendix
κρίσις, ἡ: **11, 26, 38, 40, 45, 46, 63, 69, 71, 72, 74, 78, 80, 81, 85, 88, 97, 100, 107, 108, 111, 116, 117, 126, 129, 133, 135, 136, 137, 139, 141, 145, 146, 148, 153, 158, 159, 160, 164, 166, 167, 171, 17** Appendix, 36 Appendix
κριτήριον, τό: **2, 59, 79, 88, 92, 120, 124, 145, 156, 158, 159, 160, 166, 167, 171**
κριτής, ὁ: **2, 70, 88, 120, 127, 137, 138, 146, 158, 159, 160, 167, 31** Appendix
κύριος, α, ον: **1, 22, 27, 32, 33, 57, 62, 63, 65, 71, 79, 88, 90, 92,**

94, 97, 119, 135, 137, 138, 140, 146, 147, 153, 154, 159, 163, 164, 167

λύσις, ἡ: 158
λύω: 9, 66, 111, 114, 121, 125, 144

μάρτυρ/μάρτυς, ὁ: 21, 30, 31, 54, 55, 56, 71, 100
μαρτυρέω: 21, 54, 70, 71, 74, 121, 158
μαρτυρία, ἡ: 21, 26, 54, 70
μαρτύριον, τό: 26, 74, 153
μαρτύρομαι: 122
μερίζω: 42
μεσιτεύω: 10, 64, 121, 170

νεῖκος, τό: 146, 21 Appendix
νέμω: 5, 62, 74
νικάω: 3, 18, 21, 62, 67, 71, 79, 80, 82, 120, 121, 145, 154, 156, 158, 166, 167, 171
νόμος, ὁ: 13, 15, 38, 42, 54, 62, 79, 89, 101, 121, 122, 133, 137, 139, 152, 154, 156, 158, 159, 160, 167, 170, 15 Appendix, 26 Appendix

ξενοδόκος, ὁ: 153

ὄμνυμι: 13, 38, 40, 43, 106, 109, 129, 131, 137, 146, 158, 165
ὁμογνωμονέω: 92
ὁμολογέω: 3, 13, 14, 19, 40, 64, 68, 88, 93, 98, 103, 111, 114, 121, 146, 147, 158
ὁμολογία, ἡ: 14, 21, 38, 40, 43, 44, 93, 111, 128, 129, 138, 151
ὁμόλογος, ον: 31, 33, 56, 120, 129, 131, 138, 158, 164, 167
ὁμονοέω: 137
ὁμόνοια, ἡ: 42, 76, 92, 135, 137, 158, 36 Appendix
ὁμορέω: 1, 163
ὅμορος, ον: 7 , 34, 74, 88, 120, 158, 168
ὁρίζω: 1, 5, 16, 17, 22, 74, 88, 100, 106, 111, 116, 131, 138, 146, 158, 160, 163, 166
ὅριον, τό: 16, 17, 20, 30, 33, 41, 55, 56, 65, 74, 88, 89, 99, 100, 107, 120, 129, 137, 146, 153, 154, 158, 160, 163, 164
ὁρισμός, ὁ: 74, 116, 137, 160
ὁριστής, ὁ: 100
ὁρκίζω: 62, 71, 109
ὅρκος, ὁ: 21, 37, 43, 71, 109, 129, 131, 137, 146, 163, 165
ὁροθεσία, ἡ: 126, 160, 167
ὁροθέτης, ὁ: 164
ὅρος, ὁ: 1, 15, 22, 40, 54, 63, 74, 88, 109, 114, 116, 117, 118, 129, 135, 136, 138, 146, 158, 160, 162, 163, 164, 167, 168, 21 Appendix, 32 Appendix

παλινδικία, ἡ: 80
παραβαίνω: 14, 74, 83, 167
παρανομία, ἡ: 142
παράνομος, ον: 119
παρασπονδέω: 142
παρορία, ἡ: 74, 120
παρορίζω: 74
περιαγωγή, ἡ: 88
περιηγέομαι: 30, 31, 55, 118, 129
περιήγησις, ἡ: 44, 63
περιοδεύω: 153
περιορίζω: 168
περιορισμός, ὁ: 88, 158, 168
πολεμέω: 57, 59, 97, 122, 127, 142, 147

πόλεμος, ὁ: 10, 12, 27, 34, 39, 40, 47, 48, 49, 51, 52, 53, 54, 58, 66, 69, 71, 74, 76, 81, 87, 90, 94, 97, 99, 102, 105, 106, 109, 113, 114, 121, 122, 123, 127, 135, 136, 142, 144, 147, 148, 158, 160, 161, 164, 171
πρεσβεία, ἡ: 5, 26, 52, 74, 89, 90, 106, 114, 121, 122, 124, 138, 147, 148, 156, 158, 160, 161, 162, 163, 169, 170, 171
πρεσβεύς, ὁ: 7, 10, 12, 21, 53, 57, 60, 72, 76, 77, 94, 102, 106, 111, 114, 121, 122, 140, 142, 147, 148
πρεσβευτής, ὁ: 1, 12, 22, 40, 42, 47, 48, 51, 58, 61, 68, 74, 78, 79, 85, 90, 91, 94, 98, 99, 102, 104, 105, 106, 109, 112, 114, 115, 117, 119, 120, 122, 123, 126, 127, 129, 130, 131, 134, 135, 138, 138, 142, 144, 146, 148, 152, 156, 158, 159, 160, 161, 163, 166, 167, 169, 170, 171
πρεσβεύω: 5, 7, 35, 78, 88, 94, 98, 102, 105, 111, 112, 120, 128, 140, 143, 146, 151, 158, 164, 165, 167, 169, 171
προδικέω: 125
πρόδικος, ον/πρόδικος, ὁ: 21, 67, 137
προκαλέω: 78, 113, 148, 168
πρόκλησις, ἡ: 21, 168
προκρίνω: 120, 171
προσκρίνω: 120
προσορίζω: 71

ῥύσιον, τό: 105, 140 (cf. 138)

σύγκλητος, ἡ: 1, 59, 76, 77, 78, 79, 93, 94, 101, 102, 104, 105, 106, 111, 112, 114, 120, 121, 122, 123, 131, 134, 135, 142, 143, 144, 148, 155, 156, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 167, 169, 171
συλάω: 143, 168, 170
σύλη, ἡ/σῦλον, τό: 109, 168
συλικός, ή, όν: 168
σύλλυσις, ἡ: 63, 64, 83, 90, 109, 137, 146, 158, 161, 170
συλλύω: 63, 64, 74, 109, 114, 146
συμβόλαιος, α, ον: 13, 90, 106, 146
συμβολή, ἡ/σύμβολον, τό/σύμβολα, τά: 40, 67, 106, 140, 158
συμμαχέω: 12, 35, 109, 32 Appendix
συμμαχία, ἡ: 34, 47, 48, 57, 76, 92, 99, 102, 111, 134, 142, 151, 156, 158, 160, 161, 165, 32 Appendix
σύμμαχος, ον: 14, 33, 45, 57, 76, 93, 99, 102, 120, 127, 137, 142, 156, 158, 160, 161, 164
συμπολιτεία, ἡ: 76
συμφωνέω: 88, 138
σύμφωνος, ον: 111, 125, 129, 147, 167
συναγωνίζομαι: 117
συνάλλαγμα, τό: 13, 38, 92, 105
συναλλάσσω: 35, 57, 77
συνδικαστής, ὁ: 118
σύνδικος, ὁ: 19, 137, 145, 168, 33 Appendix, 40 Appendix
συνέδριον, τό: 2, 3, 56, 76, 102, 111, 114, 122, 129, 147, 148
σύνεδρος, ὁ: 87, 145, 154, 159, 167, 168
συνέκδικος, ὁ: 85, 171
συνηγορέω: 21, 71, 124
συνήγορος, ὁ: 23

συνθήκη, ἡ/συνθῆκαι, αἱ: 2, 9, 10, 13, 14, 33, 47, 57, 71, 74, 76, 92, 93, 97, 109, 121, 128, 142, 153, 165, 170
συνομολογέω: 13, 26, 88, 159
συνομολογία, ἡ: 160
σφραγίζω: 21, 54, 71, 83, 109, 159
σφραγίς, ἡ: 21, 71, 83, 159

τεκμήριον, τό: 88, 146, 158
τεμενίζω: 24
τέμενος, τό: 24, 54, 71, 88, 117, 164, 32 Appendix
τερμάζω: 33
τερμονίζω: 38
τερμονισμός, ὁ: 38
τέρμων, ὁ: 33, 82, 131, 153
τιμάω: 39, 124
τίμημα, τό: 67, 83, 107, 111, 168
τόπος, ὁ: 54, 63, 70, 71, 74, 85, 88, 100, 108, 109, 117, 120, 126, 146, 160, 161, 162, 163, 168, 171

ὕπατος: 79, 88, 150, 156, 158, 159
ὑπόδικος, ον: 43, 48, 71, 129, 137
ὑφήγησις, ἡ: 88

φιλία, ἡ: 35, 40, 49, 61, 71, 77, 92, 93, 97, 109, 111, 117, 120, 122, 127, 142, 151, 155, 156, 158, 159, 160, 163, 32 Appendix
φίλος, η, ον: 35, 52, 57, 60, 99, 106, 122, 142, 146, 156, 158, 160, 164
φυγοδικέω: 171

χώρα, ἡ: 1, 5, 6, 15, 20, 22, 24, 25, 26, 30, 31, 33, 38, 40, 41, 42, 44, 46, 55, 56, 63, 65, 70, 74, 79, 80, 88, 89, 98, 99, 101, 103, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 113, 116, 117, 118, 120, 126, 128, 129, 130, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 143, 146, 147, 149, 150, 153, 154, 156, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 32 Appendix
χωρίον, τό: 45, 88, 138, 156, 158, 167
χωρογραφία, ἡ: 158

ψηφίζω: 21, 38, 40, 47, 83, 113, 119, 127, 128, 146, 148, 169, 170
ψήφισμα, τό: 21, 26, 40, 42, 43, 74, 80, 87, 89, 90, 93, 117, 119, 120, 122, 126, 127, 145, 146, 161, 164, 169, 170, 171

accusator: 106
aestimatio: 72
altercatio: 96
ambigo: 84, 88
amicitia: 77, 97, 121
amicus: 73, 122
arbiter: 72
arbitrium: 50, 72, 76, 102, 150, 159
arbitror: 84
auctoritas: 75, 76, 88, 94, 96, 121, 122, 123

bellum: 8, 57, 60, 72, 73, 75, 76, 84, 94, 95, 96, 97, 102, 104, 106, 112, 121, 122, 123

certamen: 77, 104
colloquium: 72, 123
compono: 121

concilio: 121
concilium: 84, 86, 94, 96, 111
concordia: 122
consul: 72, 73, 94, 95, 96, 106, 123
consultum: 102, 122
contentio: 84
controversia: 84, 88, 96, 97, 106, 114
crimen: 94, 106

decerno: 50, 75, 106, 111, 123, 150
decretum: 76, 88, 106
deditio: 86
denuntiatio: 96, 121
denuntio: 60, 121
deprecator: 121
deprecor: 75, 94, 121, 123
determinatio: 88
determino: 88
dimico: 84
dirimo: 57, 77, 104
disceptatio: 96, 106, 111, 123
disceptator: 84
discepto: 84, 96, 97, 104, 106
dissero: 84, 121
dux: 73, 84, 123

fides: 84
finio: 106, 121, 122, 123
finis: 73, 88, 96, 121
foedus: 84, 96, 102, 121

hostis: 72, 73, 94, 121

imperator: 150, 159
impero: 72, 73, 86
indutiae: 94, 123
iniuria: 60, 72, 106
iniustus, a, um: 121

iudex: 72, 88
iudicium: 50, 88, 97, 111, 150, 159
ius: 50, 60, 84, 97, 102, 106, 111, 121

legatio: 50, 60, 84, 94, 96, 102, 106, 114, 121
legatus: 8, 57, 60, 73, 75, 76, 77, 84, 94, 95, 96, 98, 102, 104, 106, 112, 114, 121, 122, 123, 148
lex: 76, 96
limes: 88
lis: 88
locus: 88

pacificator: 57
pax: 72, 73, 75, 84, 94, 102, 112, 121, 122, 123, 148
postulatio: 106, 121
praetor: 72, 95, 150, 159
princeps: 88, 94, 96, 102, 106

querella: 106
querimonia: 106
queror: 72, 77, 106, 114

recuso: 86
regio: 88
regnum: 73, 106, 122
reus: 106
rex: 57, 60, 72, 73, 76, 77, 84, 94, 102, 104, 106, 112, 114, 121, 122, 123, 148, 150, 159
rogo: 84

senatus: 60, 73, 76, 77, 84, 88, 94, 96, 102, 104, 106, 112, 114, 121, 122, 123
sententia: 50, 88
societas: 84

socius: **60**, **73**, **75**, **84**, **97**, **122**

terminus: **88**, **106**
terra: **50**, **73**
testor: **75**

tumultus: **96**

victoria: **106**, **121**, **123**
vinco: **94**
vindico: **121**
vis: **72**, **106**

Abbreviations and Bibliography

ABBREVIATIONS

AA	*Archäologischer Anzeiger.*
AAPal	*Atti del Accademia di scienze, lettere ed arti di Palermo.*
AAT	*Atti della Accademia delle scienze di Torino, Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche.*
AAWW	*Anzeiger der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Philosophisch-historische Klasse.*
ABAW	*Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, München, Philosophisch-historische Klasse.*
ABSA	*Annual of the British School at Athens.*
AC	*Antiquité classique.*
AD	*Arkhaiologikon deltion.*
AE	*Arkhaiologike ephemeris.*
AEM	*Archäologisch-epigraphische Mitteilungen aus Österreich-Ungarn.*
AHB	*Ancient History Bulletin.*
AIV	*Atti del Istituto Veneto di scienze, lettere ed arti.*
AJA	*American Journal of Archaeology.*
AJAH	*American Journal of Ancient History.*
AJPh	*American Journal of Philology.*
ANRW	*Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung.* Berlin, 1972–.
ArchZeit	*Archäologische Zeitung.*
ASAW	*Abhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.*
ASNP	*Annali della Scuola normale superiore di Pisa, Classe di lettere e filosofia.*
BCH	*Bulletin de correspondance hellénique.*
BMus	C. T. Newton, E. L. Hicks, et al., eds. *The Collection of Ancient Greek Inscriptions in the British Museum.* Oxford, 1874–1916.

BN	*Beiträge zur Namenforschung.*
BPhW	*Berliner philologische Wochenschrift.*
BullInstArch	*Bulletin de l'Institut archéologique.*
CAH	*Cambridge Ancient History.*
Cauer[1/2]	P. Cauer. *Delectus inscriptionum graecarum propter dialectum memorabilium.* 1st ed. Leipzig, 1877. 2d ed. 1883.
Choix	F. Dürrbach, P. Roussel, and M. Launey. *Choix d'inscriptions de Délos.* Paris, 1921.
CIG	A. Böckh. *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum.* Berlin, 1828–77.
CIL	*Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum.* Berlin, 1863–.
CPh	*Classical Philology.*
CQ	*Classical Quarterly.*
CR	*Classical Review.*
CRAI	*Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres.*
EMC/CV	*Echos du monde classique/Classical Views.*
FDelphes	*Fouilles de Delphes.* III: *Épigraphie.* Paris, 1929–.
FGH	F. Jacoby. *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker.* Leiden, 1961–69.
GGA	*Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen.*
Gonnoi	B. Helly. *Gonnoi.* I: *La cité et son histoire.* II: *Les inscriptions.* Amsterdam, 1973.
GRBS	*Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies.*
HGI	E. Nachmanson. *Historische griechische Inschriften.* Bonn, 1913.
Hicks	E. L. Hicks. *Manual of Greek Historical Inscriptions.* Oxford, 1882.
Hicks/Hill	E. L. Hicks and G. F. Hill. *Manual of Greek Historical Inscriptions.* Oxford, 1901.
HSCPh	*Harvard Studies in Classical Philology.*
IAssos	R. Merkelbach. *Die Inschriften von Assos.* Bonn, 1976.
IC	M. Guarducci. *Inscriptiones Creticae.* 4 vols. Rome, 1935–50.
IEphesos	H. Wankel et al. *Die Inschriften von Ephesos.* Bonn 1979–.
IG	*Inscriptiones Graecae.* Berlin, 1890–.
IGRR	R. Cagnat et al. *Inscriptiones Graecae ad res Romanas pertinentes.* Paris, 1911–27.
Ilion	P. Frisch. *Die Inschriften von Ilion.* Bonn, 1975.
IKyme	H. Engelmann. *Die Inschriften von Kyme.* Bonn, 1976.
ILampsakos	P. Frisch. *Die Inschriften von Lampsakos.* Bonn, 1978.
IMagM	O. Kern. *Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maeander.* Berlin, 1900.
IMylasa	W. Blümel. *Die Inschriften von Mylasa.* Bonn, 1987.
IOlympia	W. Dittenberger and K. Purgold. *Olympia: Die Ergebnisse der ... Ausgrabung.* V: *Die Inschriften.* Berlin, 1896.
IPergamon	M. Fränkel. *Die Inschriften von Pergamon.* Berlin, 1890–95.

IPriene	F. Hiller von Gaertringen. *Die Inschriften von Priene.* Berlin, 1906.
ISE	L. Moretti. *Iscrizioni storiche ellenistiche.* 2 vols. Florence, 1967–75.
JAN	*Journal international d'archéologie.*
JHS	*Journal of Hellenic Studies.*
JKPh	*Jahrbücher für klassische Philologie.*
JÖAI	*Jahresheft des Österreichischen Archäologischen Instituts in Wien.*
JRS	*Journal of Roman Studies.*
LeBas/Foucart	P. LeBas. *Voyage archéologique en Grèce et en Asie Mineure.* Paris, 1847–77. Collaboration on the epigraphic editions by P. Foucart.
LeBas/Waddington	P. LeBas. *Voyage archéologique en Grèce et en Asie Mineure.* Paris, 1847–77. Collaboration on the epigraphic editions by W. H. Waddington.
LSJ	H. G. Liddell and R. Scott. *A Greek-English Lexicon.* Revised by H. S. Jones. Oxford, 1968.
LSKPh	*Leipziger Studien zur klassischen Philologie.*
MAI	*Mémoires de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres.*
MAT	*Accademia dell scienze di Torino. Memorie. Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche.*
MDAI(A)	*Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts (Abt. Athen.).*
MDAI(I)	*Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts (Abt. Istanbul).*
MEFR	*Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire de l'École française de Rome.*
Michel	C. Michel. *Recueil d'inscriptions grecques.* Brussels, 1900. Supplements, 1912, 1927.
Milet I.3	A. Rehm. *Das Delphinion in Milet.* Berlin, 1914.
MonAL	*Monumenti antichi dall'Accademia dei Lincei.*
MusItal	*Museo italiano di antichità classica.*
NJPhP	*Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pädagogik.*
OGIS	W. Dittenberger. *Orientis Graecae Inscriptiones Selectae.* Leipzig, 1905.
PAA	*Praktika tes Akademias Athenon.*
PCPhS	*Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society.*
PP	*La parola del passato.*
RA	*Revue archéologique.*
RAL	*Rendiconti della classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche dell'Accademia dei Lincei.*
RC	C. B. Welles. *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period.* New Haven, 1934.
RCr	*Revue critique.*
RD	*Revue internationale des droits de l'antiquité.*
RE	Pauly-Wissowa. *Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft.* Stuttgart, 1893–.

REA	*Revue des études anciennes.*
REG	*Revue des études grecques.* Numbered items are found in the "Bulletin épigraphique."
REp	*Revue épigraphique.*
RF(I)C	*Rivista di filologia (e d' istruzione) classica.*
RhM	*Rheinisches Museum für Philologie.*
RIJG	R. Dareste, B. Haussoullier, and T. Reinach. *Recueil des inscriptions juridiques grecques.* 2 vols. Paris, 1891–1904.
RivSA	*Rivista storica dell'antichità.*
RPh	*Revue de philologie.*
RSA	*Rivista di storia antica.*
SAWW	*Sitzungsberichte der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien, Philosophisch-historische Klasse.*
SBAW	*Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, München, Philosophisch-historische Klasse.*
Schwyzer	E. Schwyzer. *Dialectorum Graecarum exempla epigraphica potiora.* Leipzig, 1923.
SCO	*Studi classici e orientali.*
SEG	*Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum.* Leiden and Amsterdam, 1923–.
SGDI	H. Collitz and F. Bechtel. *Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften.* 4 vols. Göttingen, 1884–1915.
Sherk	R. K. Sherk. *Roman Documents from the Greek East.* Baltimore, 1969.
SIG$^{2/3}$	W. Dittenberger. *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum.* 2d ed. Leipzig, 1898. 3d ed. 1915–20.
SPAW	*Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berlin, Philosophisch-historische Klasse.*
TAPhA	*Transactions of the American Philological Association.*
Tod, *GHI*	M. N. Tod. *Greek Historical Inscriptions from 403 to 323 B.C.* Oxford, 1948.
WKPh	*Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie.*
WS	*Wiener Studien.*
ŽMNP	*Žurnal Ministerstva Narodnágo Prosveščenija.*
ZPE	*Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik.*
ZRG	*Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte.*

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbott, F. F., and A. C. Johnson. *Municipal Administration in the Roman Empire.* Princeton, 1926. [Abbott/Johnson]

Ager, S. "Judicial Imperialism: The Case of Melitaia." *AHB* 3.5 (1989) pp. 107–14.

———. "Rhodes: The Rise and Fall of a Neutral Diplomat." *Historia* 40 (1991) pp. 10–41.

———. "A Royal Arbitration between Klazomenai and Teos?" *ZPE* 85 (1991) pp. 87–97.

———. "Why War? Some Views on International Arbitration in Ancient Greece." *EMC/CV* 12.1 (1993) pp. 1–13.

———. "Κοινοδίκιον and Hellenistic Crete." *JHS* 114 (1994) pp. 1–18.

Allen, R. E. *The Attalid Kingdom.* Oxford, 1983. [Allen]

Austin, M. M. *The Hellenistic World.* Cambridge, 1981. [Austin]

Aymard, A. *Les premiers rapports de Rome et de la confédération achaienne.* Paris, 1938. [Aymard, *PR*]

Badian, E. *Foreign Clientelae (264–70 B.C.).* Oxford, 1958. [Badian, *FC*]

———. *Roman Imperialism in the Late Republic.* Oxford, 1968.

———. "Hegemony and Independence." In *Actes du VIIe Congrès de la F.I.E.C.*, pp. 397–414. Budapest, 1983.

Bagnall, R. S., and P. Derow. *Greek Historical Documents: The Hellenistic Period.* Chico, Calif., 1981. [Bagnall/Derow]

Bastini, A. *Der achäische Bund als hellenische Mittelmacht.* Frankfurt am Main, 1987. [Bastini]

Berard, V. *De arbitrio inter liberas Graecorum civitates.* Paris, 1894. [Berard]

Berthold, R. M. *Rhodes in the Hellenistic Age.* Ithaca, N.Y., 1984. [Berthold]

Billows, R. A. *Antigonos the One-Eyed and the Creation of the Hellenistic State.* Berkeley, 1990. [Billows]

Boak, A. E. R. "Greek Interstate Associations and the League of Nations." *American Journal of International Law* 15 (1921) pp. 375–83.

Bohacek, M. "Arbitration and State-Organized Tribunal in the Ancient Procedure of the Greeks and Romans." *Iura* 3 (1952) pp. 191–215.

Bonner, R., and G. Smith. "Administration of Justice in the Delphic Amphictyony." *CPh* 38 (1943) pp. 1–12.

Briscoe, J. *A Commentary on Livy, Books XXXI–XXXIII.* Oxford, 1973. *Books XXXIV–XXXVII.* Oxford, 1981. [Briscoe]

Broughton, T. R. S. *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic.* 3 vols. New York, 1951–86. [Broughton]

Buck, C. D. *The Greek Dialects.* Chicago, 1955. [Buck]

Burstein, S. M. *The Hellenistic Age from the Battle of Ipsos to the Death of Kleopatra VII.* Cambridge, 1985. [Burstein]

Calabi, I. "Il sinedrio della Lega di Corinto e le sue attribuzioni giurisdizionali." *RFIC* n.s. 28 (1950) pp. 63–69. [Calabi, *RFIC*]

———. *Ricerche sui rapporti tra le poleis.* Florence, 1953. [Calabi, *Ricerche*]

———. "Arbitrato internazionale." *Communicazioni e studi dell' Istituto di diritto internazionale e straniero* 9 (1958) pp. 241–53.

Cartledge, P., and A. Spawforth. *Hellenistic and Roman Sparta.* London and New York, 1989. [Cartledge/Spawforth, *Sparta*]

Cataldi, S. "Atene 'polis ekkletos.' " *ASNP* 9 (1979) pp. 1–37.

Chaniotis, A. "Habgierige Götter, habgierige Städte: Heiligtumsbesitz und Gebietsanspruch in den kretischen Staatsverträgen." *Ktema* 13 (1988 [1992]). [Chaniotis, *Ktema*]

Colin, G. *Rome et la Grèce de 200 à 146 av. J.-C.* Paris, 1905. [Colin]

Daux, G. *Delphes en IIe et en Ier siècle depuis l'abaissement de l'Étolie jusqu'à la paix romaine, 191–31 av. J.-C.* Paris, 1936. [Daux, *Delphes*]

Daverio Rocchi, G. "Il concetto di frontiera nella Grecia antica." *Contributi dell' Istituto di storia antica dell' Univ. del sacro cuore* 13 (1987) pp. 21–42.

———. *Frontiera e confini nella Grecia antica.* Rome, 1988. [Daverio Rocchi]

———. "La *hierà chòra* di Apollo, la piana di Cirra e i confini di Delfi." In *Mélanges Pierre Lévêque,* pp. 117–25. Paris, 1988. [Daverio Rocchi, *Mélanges*]

de Ruggiero, E. *L'arbitrato pubblico in relazione col privato presso i Romani.* Rome, 1893. [de Ruggiero]

de Taube, M. "Les origines de l'arbitrage international: Antiquité et Moyen Age." *Recueil des cours de l'Academie de droit international* 42 (1932-IV) pp. 5–56. [de Taube]

Eckstein, A. M. *Senate and General: Individual Decision Making and Roman Foreign Relations, 264–194 B.C.* Berkeley, 1987. [Eckstein, *Senate and General*]

———. "Rome, the War with Perseus, and Third Party Mediation" *Historia* 37 (1988) pp. 414–44.

Errington, R. M. *Philopoemen.* Oxford, 1969. [Errington, *Philopoemen*]

———. *The Dawn of Empire.* London, 1971. [Errington, *Dawn*]

Ferguson, W. S. *Hellenistic Athens.* London, 1911. [Ferguson, *Athens*]

Ferrary, J.-L. *Philhellénisme et impérialisme.* Paris and Rome, 1988.

Flacelière, R. *Les Aitoliens à Delphes.* Paris, 1937. [Flacelière]

Garlan, Y. "La réconciliation des ennemis dans la Grèce classique." *BCH* 102 (1978) pp. 97–103.

Gauthier, P. *Symbola.* Nancy, 1972. [Gauthier]

Gawantka, W. *Isopolitie.* Munich, 1975. [Gawantka]

Gruen, E. S. *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome.* Berkeley, 1984. [Gruen]

Guarducci, M. "Note sul *koinon* cretese." *RFIC* 28 (1950) pp. 142–54.

———. *Epigrafia greca II: Epigrafia di carattere pubblico.* Rome, 1970. [Guarducci, *Epigrafia greca*]

Hammond, N. G. L., and F. W. Walbank. *A History of Macedonia.* Vol. 3. Oxford, 1988. [Hammond/Walbank, *Macedonia,* vol. 3]

Hansen, E. V. *The Attalids of Pergamon.* 2d ed. Ithaca, N. Y., 1971. [Hansen^2]

Harding, P. *From the Peloponnesian War to the Battle of Ipsus.* Cambridge, 1985. [Harding]

Hegyi, D. "Τεμένη ἱερὰ καὶ τεμένη δημόσια." *Oikumene* 1 (1976) pp. 77–87.

Heuss, A. *Stadt und Herrscher des Hellenismus in ihren staat- und völkerrechtlichen Beziehungen.* Klio Beiheft 39 (= N.F. Heft 26). Leipzig, 1937. [Heuss]

Hitzig, H. F. "Altgriechische Staatsverträge über Rechtshilfe." In *Festgabe F. Regelsberger,* pp. 1–70. Zurich, 1907. [Hitzig]

Holleaux, M. *Rome, la Grèce et les monarchies hellénistiques.* Paris, 1935. [Holleaux, *Monarchies hellénistiques*]

———. *Études.* 5 vols. Paris, 1938–57. [Holleaux, *Études*]

Hopp, J. *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der letzten Attaliden.* Munich, 1977. [Hopp]

Huss, W. *Untersuchungen zur Aussenpolitik Ptolemaios' IV.* Munich, 1976. [Huss]

Johnson, A. C., P. R. Coleman-Norton, and F. C. Bourne. *Ancient Roman Statutes.* Austin, 1961. [Johnson et al., *ARS*]

Klose, P. *Die völkerrechtliche Ordnung der hellenistischen Staatenwelt in der Zeit von 280–168 v. Chr.* Munich, 1972. [Klose]

Larsen, J. A. O. "Federation for Peace in Ancient Greece." *CPh* 39 (1944) pp. 145–62.

———. *Representative Government in Greek and Roman History.* Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1955. [Larsen, *Representative Government*]

———. In *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome* IV, ed. T. Frank. Baltimore, 1958. [Larsen (Frank)]

———. *Greek Federal States.* Oxford, 1968. [Larsen, *GFS*]

———. "The Rights of Cities within the Achaean Confederacy." *CPh* 66 (1971) pp. 81–86.

Lécrivain, C. "L'arbitrage international dans la Grèce classique." *Mémoires de l'Académie des sciences, inscriptions et belles-lettres de Toulouse* 11.3 (1915) pp. 1–24. [Lécrivain]

Lenschau, T. "De rebus Prienensium." *Leipziger Studien* 12 (1890) pp. 113–220. [Lenschau, *LS*]

Lerat, L. *Les Locriens de l'ouest.* Vol. 2. Paris, 1952. [Lerat]

Magie, D. "Rome and the City-States of Western Asia Minor from 200 to 133 B.C." In *Anatolian Studies Presented to W. H. Buckler,* pp. 161–85. Manchester, 1939. [Magie, *Buckler Studies*]

———. *Roman Rule in Asia Minor.* 2 vols. Princeton, 1950. [Magie, *RRAM*]

Marshall, A. J. "The Survival and Development of International Jurisdiction in the Greek World under Roman Rule." *ANRW* II.13 (1980) pp. 626–61. [Marshall, *ANRW*]

Martin, V. *La vie internationale dans la Grèce des cités (VIe-IVe s. av. J.-C.).* Paris, 1940. [Martin]

Matthaei, L. E. "The Place of Arbitration and Mediation in Ancient Systems of International Ethics." *CQ* 2 (1908) pp. 241–64. [Matthaei, *CQ*]

McShane, R. B. *The Foreign Policy of the Attalids of Pergamum.* Urbana, 1964. [McShane]

Mehl, A. "Zu den diplomatischen Beziehungen zwischen Antiochos III. und Rom, 200–193 v. Chr." In *Das antike Rom und der Osten,* ed. C. Börker and M. Donderer, pp. 143–55. Erlangen, 1990. [Mehl]

Meyer, E. *Die Grenzen der hellenistischen Staaten in Kleinasien.* Zurich and Leipzig, 1925. [Meyer, *Grenzen*]

Mooren, L. "Die diplomatische Funktion der hellenistischen Königsfreunde." In *Antike Diplomatie*, ed. E. Olshausen, pp. 256–90. Darmstadt, 1979.

Mosley, D. J. "Diplomacy and Disunion in Ancient Greece." *Phoenix* 25 (1971) pp. 319–30.

Muttelsee, M. *Zur Verfassungsgeschichte Kretas im Zeitalter des Hellenismus.* Hamburg, 1925. [Muttelsee]

Niese, B. *Geschichte der griechischen und makedonischen Staaten seit der Schlacht bei Chaeronea.* 3 vols. Gotha, 1893–1903. [Niese]

Partsch, J. *Die Schriftformel im römischen Provinzialprozesse.* Breslau, 1905.

Passerini, A. "Nuove e vecchie tracce dell' interdetto *uti possidetis* negli arbitrati pubblici internazionali." *Athenaeum* 15 (1937) pp. 26–56. [Passerini, *Athenaeum*]

Petzold, K.-E. "Griechische Einfluss auf die Anfänge römischer Ostpolitik." *Historia* 41 (1992) pp. 205–45.

Philarétos, G. N. "L'arbitrage international chez les Hellènes." *Acropole* n.s. 1 (1926) pp. 37–39.

Phillipson, C. *The International Law and Custom of Greece and Rome.* London, 1911. [Phillipson]

Piccirilli, L. *Gli arbitrati interstatali greci.* Florence, 1973. [Piccirilli]

Piper, L. J. *Spartan Twilight.* New Rochelle, N.Y., 1986. [Piper]

Pomtow, H. "Delphische Neufunde II: Neue delphische Inschriften." *Klio* 15 (1918) pp. 1–77.

———. "Die delphischen Schiedsrichter-Texte und die Epidamiurgen." *Klio* 18 (1923) pp. 259–308.

Préaux, C. "La paix à l'époque hellénistique." *La Paix: Recueils de la Société J. Bodin* 14 (1962) pp. 227–301. [Préaux]

Raeder, A. *L'arbitrage international chez les Hellènes.* Kristiania, 1912. [Raeder]

Robert, L. "Les juges étrangers dans la cité grecque." In *ΞΕΝΙΟΝ: Festschrift fur Pan. J. Zepos,* vol. 1, pp. 765–82. Athens, Freiburg/Br., and Cologne, 1973.

Roebuck, C. A. "A History of Messenia from 369 to 146 B.C." Diss., University of Chicago, 1941. [Roebuck, Diss.]

———. "The Settlements of Philip II with the Greek States in 338 B.C." *CPh* 43 (1948) pp. 73–92. [Roebuck, *CPh*]

Rostovtzeff, M. *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World.* 3 vols. Oxford, 1941. [Rostovtzeff, *SEHHW*]

Roussel, P. "Delphes et l'Amphictionie après la guerre d'Aitolie." *BCH* 56 (1932) pp. 1–36.

Sartre, M. "Aspects économiques et aspects religieux de la frontière dans les cités grecques." *Ktema* 4 (1979) pp. 213–24.

Scafuro, A. C. "Prusias II of Bithynia and Third Party Arbitration." *Historia* 36 (1987) pp. 28–37.

Schmitt, H. H. *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte Antiochos' des Grossen und seiner Zeit.* Wiesbaden, 1964. [Schmitt, *Antiochos*]

———. *Die Verträge der griechisch-römischen Welt von 338 bis 200 v. Chr.* (= *Die Staatsverträge des Altertums*, Bd. III). Munich, 1969. [Schmitt]

Sherk, R. K. *Rome and the Greek East to the Death of Augustus.* Cambridge, 1984. [Sherk, *TDGR*]

Sherwin-White, A. N. "Roman Involvement in Anatolia, 167–88 B.C." *JRS* 67 (1977) pp. 62–75.

———. *Roman Foreign Policy in the East, 168 B.C.–A.D. 1.* London, 1984. [Sherwin-White]

Sherwin-White, S. M. "Ancient Archives: The Edict of Alexander to Priene, a Reappraisal." *JHS* 105 (1985) pp. 69–89.

Shimron, B. *Late Sparta: The Spartan Revolution, 243–146 B.C.* Arethusa Monographs 3. Buffalo, 1972. [Shimron]

Shipley, G. *A History of Samos, 800–188 B.C.* Oxford, 1987. [Shipley]

Sonne, E. *De arbitris externis, quos Graeci adhibuerunt ad lites et intestinas et peregrinas componendas, quaestiones epigraphicae.* Göttingen, 1888. [Sonne]

Stählin, F. *Das hellenische Thessalien.* Stuttgart, 1924. [Stählin]

Steinwenter, A. *Die Streitbeendigung durch Urteil, Schiedsspruch und Vergleich nach griechischem Rechte.* Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte, Heft 8. Munich, 1925. [Steinwenter]

Swoboda, H. "Studien zu den griechischen Bünden: 3. Die Städte im achäischen Bunde." *Klio* 12 (1912) pp. 17–50.

Taeuber, H. "International Gerichtsbarkeit in Arkadien." In *Berichte vom 1. Österreichischen Althistorikertreffen*, ed. I. Weiler, pp. 32–36. Graz, 1983. [Taeuber]

Ténékidès, G. "Droit international et communautés fédérales dans la Grèce des cités." *Recueil des cours de l'Académie de droit international* 90 (1956-II) pp. 475–652. [Ténékidès]

Thür, G. "Neuere Untersuchungen zum Prozeßrecht der griechischen Poleis: Formen des Urteils." In *Akten des 26. Deutschen Rechtshistorikertages*, ed. D. Simon, pp. 467–84. Frankfurt am Main, 1987. [Thür]

Tod, M. N. *International Arbitration amongst the Greeks.* Oxford, 1913. [Tod]

———. "Inter-state Arbitration in the Greek World." In *Sidelights on Greek History*, pp. 37–68. Oxford, 1932. [Tod, *Sidelights*]

van Effenterre, H. *La Crète et le monde grec de Platon à Polybe.* Paris, 1948. [van Effenterre]

Viereck, P. *Sermo Graecus quo senatus populusque Romanus magistratusque populi Romani usque ad Tiberii Caesaris aetatem in scriptis publicis usi sunt examinatur.* Göttingen, 1888. [Viereck]

Walbank, F. W. *Philip V of Macedon.* Cambridge, 1940. [Walbank, *Philip V*]

———. *A Commentary on Polybius.* 3 vols. Oxford, 1957–78. [Walbank, *Comm*]

Waser, H. *Das zwischenstaatliche Schiedsgericht als Spiegel der abendländischen Geschichte.* Zurich, 1960.

Westermann, W. L. "Interstate Arbitration in Antiquity." *CJ* 2 (1906–7) pp. 197–211.

Wilhelm, A. *Beiträge zur griechischen Inschriftenkunde.* Vienna, 1909. [Wilhelm, *Beiträge*]

———. *Attische Urkunden* (= *SAWW* 165.6 et al.). Vienna, 1911. [Wilhelm, *Attische Urkunden*]

———. *Neue Beiträge zur griechischen Inschriftenkunde* (= *SAWW* 166.1 et al.). Vienna, 1911–32. [Wilhelm, *Neue Beiträge*]

———. "Griechische Inschriften rechtlichen Inhalts." *Pragmateiai de l'Académie d'Athènes* 17.1. Athens, 1951. [Wilhelm, *GIRI*]

Will, E. *Histoire politique du monde hellénistique.* 2 vols. 2d ed. Nancy, 1979–82. [Will]

Wolff, H. J. "The Origin of Judicial Litigation among the Greeks." *Traditio* 4 (1946) pp. 31–87.

Yoshimura, T. "Zum römischen *libertas*-Begriff in der Aussenpolitik im zweiten Jahrhundert vor Chr." *AJAH* 9 (1984) pp. 1–22.

Compositor: Humanist Typesetting & Graphics, Inc.
Text: Baskerville 10/12
Display: Baskerville
Greek: Ibycus by Silvio Levy
modified by Pierre A. MacKay
Printer: Thomson-Shore, Inc.
Binder: Thomson-Shore, Inc.